

# The Visions

—OF—

MRS. E. G. WHITE,

A

MANIFESTATION OF SPIRITUAL GIFTS

ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES.

BY FRIAD SMITH.

---

<sup>1</sup> And the dragon was revealed with the woman (the church), and went to make war with the remnant of her seed which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ. —REV. xii, 17.

<sup>2</sup> For the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. —REV. xx, 10.

---

STEAM PRESS  
OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,  
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.  
1868.

THE VISIONS

—OF—

MRS. E. G. WHITE,

A MANIFESTATION OF SPIRITUAL GIFTS

ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES.

---

"Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."  
—REV. xiv, 12.

"For the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."—REV. xx, 10.

---

STEAM PRESS  
OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,  
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.  
1868.

## The Visions: Objections Answered.

---

ONE of the most important subjects treated upon in the New Testament, is the doctrine of Spiritual Gifts. Paul gives it equal rank with the great question of the state of the dead, and says, "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant." 1 Cor. xii, 1. He then proceeds to explain himself by saying that there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; that is, there are various operations produced by the Spirit of God, and a variety of manifestations that result from its presence; but all are wrought by the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will. The apostle's argument in the chapter already referred to, in Eph. iv, and in other places in the New Testament, places it beyond denial that wherever the Spirit of God is present in sufficient measure, it will operate in some of the special ways which he has described; and to assert, as some do, that the age of miracles and spiritual gifts is past, so that it is impossible for the people of God to enjoy such privileges at the present time, is tantamount to an assertion that it is now, and has been ever since the so-called apostolic age, impossible for them to enjoy a sufficient measure of the Spirit to produce these results. But is there any limitation in this respect? Is it not the privilege of the church in one age to enjoy as much of the Spirit

Vault

W

361

565

Smith

HER.



of God as in another? Did the Lord design that to his first disciples the supply should be continual and without measure, while to his followers in later and more degenerate ages, it should be intermittent and meager? Impossible! It is indeed a convenient excuse for living below one's privilege to say that these manifestations were not designed to continue through the gospel age; but is not the lack of them in any age, in the words of Chrysostom, quoted by Mr. Wesley to Dr. Middleton, to be ascribed "to the want of faith and virtue and piety in those times?"

But it is not our object to enter here into an argument for the perpetuity of these gifts in the present dispensation. This has already been done in *Spiritual Gifts*, Vol. i, pp. 5-16, and in *Miraculous Powers*, pp. 11-44, to which we would refer the reader. Nor shall we labor to show that all through this dispensation they have been more or less in exercise; as this is also shown in the work last mentioned, by numerous instances drawn from reliable sources. All that is to our purpose here, is simply to affirm that Seventh-day Adventists do believe in the Gifts of the Spirit as above set forth. They believe that the varied operations of the Spirit of God, having been once expressly "set in the church," were designed to continue therein to the end, because they are not limited, and God has never withdrawn them from the church; just as they believe that the original blessing placed in the beginning upon the seventh day, is there still, because God never has withdrawn it, nor placed it upon any other day.

To them, the doctrine of *Spiritual Gifts*, as set forth in the chapters referred to, is as much a special doctrine of Revelation, as is the Sabbath,

the Sanctuary, the State of the Dead, or the Second Advent. Taking the Scriptures to be in deed and in truth the word of God, they cannot reject it. They can as easily explain away the Sabbath, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and many other prominent and scriptural doctrines, as the doctrine of *Spiritual Gifts*, and hence believe that to reject it, is to be guilty of error, and that to receive it, is essential to the unity of the faith.

In addition to this theoretical view of the subject, and in addition to the ordinary operations of the Spirit of God, they believe that they have in their midst a special manifestation, answering to one at least of these gifts which have been placed in the Christian church. This is found in the visions of Mrs. E. G. White, as published in the works entitled, *Experience and Views*, with *Supplement*, *Testimonies to the Church*, and *Spiritual Gifts*, Vols. i-iv.

Every test which can be brought to bear upon such manifestations, proves these genuine. The evidence which supports them, internal and external, is conclusive. They agree with the word of God, and with themselves. They are given, unless those best qualified to judge are invariably deceived, when the Spirit of God is especially present. They are free from the disgusting contortions and grimaces which attend the counterfeit manifestations of Spiritualism. Calm, dignified, impressive, they commend themselves to every beholder, as the very opposite of that which is false or fanatical. The instrument is herself above jugglery or deceit.

The influence is not mesmeric; for this people, reprobating the use of that agency, studiously refuse to learn the principles of its application, or



to have aught to do with its practical workings; besides, the hallucinations of a mesmerized subject embrace only such facts and scenes as previously exist in the mind of the mesmerizing power; but the visions take cognizance of persons and things, and bring to light facts known, not only by no person present, but not even by the one through whom the visions are given.

They are not the effect of disease; for no disease has ever yet been known to have the effect of repeatedly suspending the functions of the lungs, muscles, and every bodily sense, from fifteen to one hundred and eighty minutes, while in obedience to some influence which evidently had supreme possession of the mind, and in obedience to that alone, the eyes would see, the lips speak, and the limbs move.

Further, their fruit is such as to show that the source from which they spring is the opposite of evil.

1. They tend to the purest morality. They discountenance every vice, and exhort to the practice of every virtue. They point out the perils through which we are to pass to the kingdom. They reveal the devices of Satan. They warn us against his snares. They have nipped in the bud scheme after scheme of fanaticism which the enemy has tried to foist into our midst. They have exposed hidden iniquity, brought to light concealed wrongs, and laid bare the evil motives of the false-hearted. They have warded off dangers from the cause of truth upon every hand. They have aroused and re-aroused us to greater consecration to God, more zealous efforts for holiness of heart, and greater diligence in the cause and service of our Master.

2. They lead us to Christ. Like the Bible,

they set him forth as the only hope and only Saviour of mankind. They portray before us in living characters his holy life and his godly example, and with irresistible appeals they urge us to follow in his steps.

3. They lead us to the Bible. They set forth that book as the inspired and unalterable word of God. They exhort us to take that word as the man of our counsel, and the rule of our faith and practice. And with a compelling power, they entreat us to study long and diligently its pages, and become familiar with its teaching, for it is to judge us in the last day.

4. They have brought comfort and consolation to many hearts. They have strengthened the weak, encouraged the feeble, raised up the despondent. They have brought order out of confusion, made crooked places straight, and thrown light on what was dark and obscure. And no person, with an unprejudiced mind, can read their stirring appeals for a pure and lofty morality, their exaltation of God and the Saviour, their denunciations of every evil, and their exhortations to everything that is holy and of good report, without being compelled to say, "These are not the words of him that hath a devil."

Negatively, they have never been known to counsel evil or devise wickedness. No instance can be found in which they have lowered the standard of morality. No one of their adherents has ever been led by them into paths of transgression and sin. They do not lead men to serve God less faithfully or to love him less fervently. They do not lead to any of the works of the flesh, nor make less devoted and faithful Christians of those who believe them. In not a single instance



can any of the charges here mentioned be sustained against them; and, concerning them, we may emphatically ask the question which Pilate put to the Jews in reference to the Saviour, "Why, what evil hath he done?"

Yet with all this array of good fruit which they are able to present, with all this innocency of any charge of evil that can be brought against them, they everywhere encounter the bitterest opposition. They are the object of the blindest prejudice, the intensest hate, and most malignant bitterness. Worldlings and formal professors of all denominations, join in one general outcry against them of vituperation and abuse. Many will go a long distance out of their way for the purpose of giving them an uncalled-for and malicious thrust. And false-hearted brethren in our own ranks make them the butt of their first attacks, as they launch off into apostasy and rebellion. Why is all this? Whence all this war against that of which no evil can be said? From the example of Cain who slew his brother, of the Jews who clamored for the blood of the innocent Saviour, of the infidel who storms with passion at the very name of Jesus, and from the principle of the carnal heart which is at enmity with everything that is holy and spiritual, we leave the reader to answer.

Some of those who so strenuously oppose the visions, have a series of objections which they offer in justification of their course. But before we look at these, let us for a moment survey the field, that we may, if possible, take in at a glance the cause, object, and aim, of this contest, and so be better prepared to put a just estimate upon the motives and efforts of the opposition. We believe, love, and defend the visions, on the grounds above

set forth, their unvarying tendency to good, and because they so admirably answer the purpose for which the Scriptures assure us that the gifts were set in the church, namely, to comfort, encourage, and edify the saints, and bring them to the unity of the faith. On what ground can they be objected to? What is there in the fact that a person among Seventh-day Adventists, a sincere Christian, has visions and has published them to the world, to excite all the stir and opposition that is everywhere raised over them? They do no hurt; what is the matter? They injure no one; then why not let the person enjoy her gift undisturbed, and those who choose to believe in it, believe in it in peace?

But no! This work, innocent as it is of all evil, fruitful as it is of all good, must not be suffered to go on in peace. And again we ask, Why? We wish the reader carefully to consider this question. If we look at those who oppose this work and consider the ground they occupy, we shall be able to define pretty accurately the motives from which they act. There are two classes which may be described, with the motives that govern them, as follows:

The first class is composed of those who believe, or did believe at the time their opposition commenced, the views held by Seventh-day Adventists, but in whom, or in some one with whom they sympathized, wrongs were pointed out and reproved by the visions. These same individuals had no doubt often prayed, Lord, show us our wrongs. The Lord answers their prayers in his own way, and chooses to point them out in vision. Now if they object to this, they show at once that there was no sincerity in their petitions; for they



cannot sincerely wish to know their faults, if they are not willing to have them pointed out except in a way of their own choosing. They should rather be grateful that they are made known to them in any manner, and that time and opportunity are given them to put them away before it is too late. But here too many rebel; and here comes in the first class of objectors to the visions. Not being dead to sin, they give way to the promptings of their still dominant carnal heart, and set to work, not to repent of their wrongs which they cannot deny, but to break down that which has kindly, yet plainly, pointed out their wrongs, that they may see and put them away before the Judgment. They would prefer that the church should be without eyes, rather than that any of their wrongs should be seen and exposed.

The other class consists of those who are the avowed and open opponents of all the distinguishing views held by Seventh-day Adventists. Their opposition springs from a different motive from that of the first class. Not having been reproved themselves by the visions, they have no ground for opposition in this respect; but they hate that system of truth with which the visions stand connected, and they attack the visions as the most sure and effectual way of hindering the progress of that truth. In this they acknowledge the efficiency of the visions in advancing this work. They know them to be one of the great elements of its strength and prosperity. And do they not by such a course plainly tell us, who love the truth, how we should regard the visions? If the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light, so the opponents of the truth are wiser than some of its professed

friends. The old adage, "It is lawful to learn even from an enemy," may be put in practice by us here. If those who would gladly see this work come to nought, attack the visions as the most effectual way of accomplishing this, should not those who desire the work to advance and prosper be equally zealous in loving, living out, and defending the visions, as one of the most effectual means of securing this result? Consistency forbids that they should be esteemed of less importance by their friends than by their foes.

This covers the whole ground of the opposition; for we have never known any objection to arise which could not be traced to one or the other of these two sources. The opposer is always a person who has either been reproved for wrongs himself, or is in sympathy with those who have been so reproved, or he is a person who is openly hostile to the positions of S. D. Adventists as a whole. But neither of these positions is, in our mind, very well calculated to enlist the sympathy of any sincere lover of honesty and uprightness, or any true friend of the cause.

Having thus seen who oppose the visions, and why they do it, we are prepared to look at the objections, through which they would fain exhibit some shadow of a foundation for their incessant and zealous warfare. But a singular fact meets us at the outset: At one time the opposers of the visions cry out against them as presenting nothing new. They are, it is claimed, in the main, in harmony with a previously-received theory or impression. The view is first decided upon, and then the visions fall in with it. And this is urged as proof that they are dependent on human opinion, and hence are of human origin. At an-



other time they accuse them of leading out and adding to the word of God. So that, as presented by the objector, the matter stands thus: At one time the visions contain nothing new, and then they are founded on human opinion; at another time they do present new things, and then they are an addition to the word of God. At one time the theory is first formed, and the visions fall in, or, in other words, are led by human opinion; at another time they determine the theory, and we are a deluded, vision-led people. So they will not be satisfied either way. But these two claims devour each other; for if the visions are determined by preconceived views, we lead them, not they us. But if they lead us, as they are more commonly accused of doing, then they are not governed by any predetermined opinions or views. Now our opponents would greatly oblige us by deciding which of these two positions they will take. They cannot retain them both; and when they determine which they will surrender, we are ready to enter upon the work of answering the other.

But we proceed to a more particular examination of the objections offered. In these the objectors everywhere betray a consciousness of a painful scarcity of material; and hence there is throughout a labored effort to make the most of every little point that can be seized upon, and present it in a greatly magnified or perverted light. And finding even these limited, to make their objections appear respectable as to numbers, they go still further, and finding acts in the course of individuals which they construe to be contrary to the testimony of the visions, they incorporate them in as objections to the visions themselves!

With this class of objections, of course, we have nothing to do, in answering objections to the visions; for though every believer in them should grossly violate their teaching, it would have no bearing whatever on the question of their authenticity.

#### OBJECTION 1.—THE BIBLE AND THE BIBLE ALONE.

The first and most general objection, and the one which contains the most specious fallacy, is the cry of "The Bible and the Bible Alone," as opposed to the visions. We do not receive the visions, say they; we have no need of them; the Bible is a sufficient rule of faith. We stand upon the Bible and the Bible alone. Such declarations, in connection with outspoken denunciations of the visions, are most effectually calculated to warp the judgment of the unguarded, and fasten upon their minds the impression that to receive the visions is to reject the Bible, and to cling to the Bible is to discard the visions. A greater fallacy never existed. Look at the fields which they respectively occupy. The Bible is able to make us wise unto salvation, and thoroughly furnish us unto all good works. Do the visions propose to invade this field, and erect a new standard, and give us another rule of faith and practice? Nothing of the kind. On the contrary, they are ever in harmony with the word, and ever refer to that as the test and standard. To the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.

But by taking our stand on the Bible, and the Bible alone, we bind ourselves to receive all that it teaches, and to acknowledge every agency which



it assures us that God has placed in the Christian church. Now the Bible has something to say on the subject of visions. It tells us that the present dispensation is the "dispensation of the Spirit." It assures us that during this time, the Comforter, or Spirit of truth, would be with the true church, to lead them into all truth. The prophecy to be fulfilled during the same time, is given us in these words: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." It tells us that this Spirit has certain distinct and definite channels through which it will operate; and that under its influence there will be manifestations of wisdom, knowledge, faith, gifts of healing, working of miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, divers kinds of tongues, and interpretation of tongues. 1 Cor. xii, 8-10. And hence when the prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit in this dispensation is announced, it is immediately added, "And your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions." "And also," continues Joel, "upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit," and Peter adds, as if it were an unailing consequent, "And they shall prophesy." Acts ii, 16-18. Here are set before us the operations of the Spirit of God, and in these it is declared that the daughters as well as the sons, the handmaids as well as the servants, are to participate.

In making us wise unto salvation, and thoroughly furnishing us unto all good works, the Bible is thus careful to instruct us as to the place which the Spirit of God is designed to fill, and the part which it is to act. It declares that the means

by which the saints are to be perfected, the work of the ministry performed, and the body of Christ edified, till we all come into the unity of the faith, are these various operations of the Spirit of God, in connection with the word. Now is there any such thing as standing upon the Bible and the Bible alone, and yet rejecting these agencies? There certainly is not. Those who reject these things, and deny that God has made any provision for the instruction of his people in these days through the gifts of visions or prophecy in the church, just so far depart from their doctrine of the Bible and the Bible alone, and deny the Bible itself.

If any should say that they do not deny the doctrine of spiritual gifts as a Bible theory, but do not believe that the manifestations we now have are genuine, then this objection of the Bible and the Bible alone, is abandoned as opposed to the visions, and objections against them must be based on other grounds. Inasmuch as the Bible expressly provides for visions, no objections can be raised against any visions on the ground of the Bible and the Bible alone. It is all a fallacy. The only ground upon which any of them can be rejected, is to bring them to the word, the test, and show that their characteristics are not such as were to attend the genuine manifestations. And of this test we invite an application to the visions received among Seventh-day Adventists.

#### OBJECTION 2.—ADDING TO THE BIBLE.

It is objected again to the visions that they are an addition to the word of God, and hence come under the fearful denunciation of Rev. xxii, 18,



"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Those who raise this objection, place themselves under obligation to show that the visions are an addition to the word of God; an obligation which they have never discharged. Whenever they will carefully consider the language of the text above quoted, they will see that it has reference to the book of Revelation alone. That book was given when the Mystery of Iniquity was already at work. A time of apostasy and forgery was immediately to succeed. And it was to guard the purity of this book that this caution was given. Whoever shall endeavor to foist sentiments of his own into the book of Revelation, and palm them off upon the people as a part of the book of *Revelation* itself, he should be subject to the plagues written therein. And on the contrary, whoever should attempt to suppress any part of the testimony which God had placed in that book as his genuine word, his name should be likewise taken from the book of life. But any subsequent instruction given by the Lord to his people through visions, dreams, tongues, or any of the operations of his Spirit, would no more be an addition to the book of Revelation, than the Revelation was an addition to the book of Daniel. If any think it would, they will please account for the fact, in harmony with their view, that the Gospel of John was written by inspiration at a

later date than the book of Revelation; for this is a fact which can be most conclusively proved.

In harmony with the principle here advocated, we are expressly told in some of Paul's instruction, which has undoubted reference to the last days, not to despise prophesyings, which does not mean the prophecies, but prophesying, or the exercise of the gift of prophecy, in the present tense. 1 Thess. v, 20.

### OBJECTION 3.—LIMITED EXTENT OF THE GIFTS.

If these are genuine gifts of the Spirit, the question is asked, Why are they not more extensive? why are they confined to one person, and that one a woman? To which we answer that it cannot be that the prophecy given by Joel, and repeated by Peter, was intended to allot to each division of the human race, male and female, those gifts, and none others, which they were respectively to enjoy. And inasmuch as both males and females are mentioned in the prophecy, we understand that all the different operations of the Spirit there mentioned are to be exercised by them indiscriminately. Hence there is no prohibition against young women's seeing visions, in the fact that the prophecy says that young men shall see them, nor against young men's having dreams, because it says old men are to have them. These both are among the means by which God sometimes sees fit to communicate prophetic knowledge, and in which both the sons and daughters are to participate; for your sons and your daughters, says the record, shall prophesy.

In regard to the limited extent of the visions, it



is certainly nothing against their authenticity that they are as yet confined to one individual. It is certainly a great advance over years preceding the proclamation of the Advent doctrine, that we have them at all. And if, in addition to this, we find that the people of God have been in exactly the same circumstances before, then certainly we ought not to regard this state of things as involving any difficulty over which there is occasion to stumble. We refer the objector to the time of Deborah, the prophetess, *Judg. iv, 4*, the only one through whom God at that time communicated instruction to his people; for they inquired of her; and that one was a woman. See also a similar case in the time of Huldah the prophetess. *2 Kings xxii, 14*.

But to these instances it is objected, 1. That in the days of Deborah they had the Urim and Thummim, by which to inquire of the Lord; and 2. In the days of Huldah, there were other prophets in Israel. To which we reply:

1. The Urim and Thummim were connected with the breastplate of the high priest; and it is true that Israel in those days had a typical priesthood to convey instruction to the people, and mediate between them and God. But this has nothing whatever to do with the question at issue. The limited manifestation of the gift of prophecy, is the point under consideration; and the fact is, there was but one person at that time in Israel of which we have any record, upon whom the spirit of prophecy rested; and that one was a woman. It is so now. Hence, in this respect, the situation of the church now is exactly parallel to that of Israel of old. And if the fact that these manifestations are at present confined to one individual, is any evidence against their authenticity, it is

equally so in the case of Deborah. But if the manifestations then, though given through only one out of all the hosts of Israel, and that one a woman, were genuine, those given under exactly the same circumstances, may be so now.

2. In the time of Huldah there were other prophets in Israel, Jeremiah, Zephaniah, and perhaps Habakkuk. Well, would Huldah's testimony have been any the less reliable, had there been no others? This renders her case all the more remarkable. Why, when there were others who prophesied, and they men, did the king send the high priest, the scribe, and his servants, to inquire of a woman the meaning of the law of the Lord? Those who feel so averse to a woman's occupying any public position in the work of the Lord, will do well to make this fact a special subject of study. On this circumstance Dr. Clarke makes the following excellent remarks: "Went unto Huldah the prophetess."] This is a most singular circumstance. At this time Jeremiah was certainly a prophet in Israel, but it is likely he now dwelt at Anathoth, and could not be readily consulted; Zephaniah also prophesied under this reign, but probably he had not yet begun; Hilkiah was high priest, and the priest's lips should retain knowledge; Shaphan was scribe, and must have been conversant in sacred affairs to have been at all fit for his office; and yet Huldah, a prophetess, of whom we know nothing but by this circumstance, is consulted on the meaning of the book of the law; for the secret of the Lord was neither with Hilkiah the high priest, Shaphan the scribe, nor any other of the servants of the king, or ministers of the temple! We find from this, and we have many facts in all ages to corroborate it, that



a pontiff, a pope, a bishop, or a priest, may, in some cases, not possess the true knowledge of God; and that a simple woman, possessing the life of God in her soul, may have more knowledge of the divine testimonies than many of those whose office it is to explain and enforce them."

#### OBJECTION 4.—THE SHUT DOOR.

We now come to the teachings of the visions themselves. And it is proper here to remark that very much is reported purporting to be the testimony of the visions, for which they are not at all responsible. As a story in circulation never loses anything in its passage from one to another, but frequently comes out a very different thing from what it was when it started, so sentences spoken in vision, passing from one to another without being committed to writing, have not always been accurately reproduced by memories to which they have been entrusted, and so have come to assume a very different complexion from that which they at first wore. Our only proper course here, therefore, is to confine ourselves to what has been published under sister White's own supervision, and by her authority, and what appears in manuscript over her own signature in her own handwriting.

With these remarks we come to the question of the shut door, over which there has perhaps been a greater ado than over any other doctrine which the visions are supposed to teach. What, then, is meant by the shut door? Opponents of the visions say that it means the close of probation, and the end of salvation for sinners. The visions do not so teach. This is a definition of their own; and the amusement they find in attacking it is

wholly gratuitous. Reduced to a syllogism, their objection stands thus: 1. The visions teach that the door of mercy was shut in 1844, and that there has been no salvation for sinners, and hence no genuine conversions since that time. 2. But there have been multitudes of genuine conversions since then. 3. Therefore the visions are false. We answer, the visions say nothing about the door of mercy; and they teach that a door was opened, as well as one shut, in 1844, as we shall see when we come to look at their testimony. Those who endeavor to show that the visions teach as above, bring in first the testimony of men, some of whom may perhaps have entertained the strong view above presented. To this we have only to say that such testimony has nothing to do with the case in hand. Our inquiry is, not what men have believed, however strongly they may have believed the visions, but, what the visions themselves have taught. And if it could be shown that men have believed and taught the shut door in its extremest sense, so much the better for the visions, if it should finally appear that they have *not* so taught. It would thus be very evident that their testimony is not in the least influenced by the views of their friends.

But before we come to their teaching, let us look for a moment at a few Bible facts on this subject. The expression, "shut door," is derived from the parable of Matt. xxv, 1-13, in which Advent experience is illustrated by the incidents of an Eastern marriage. There is the going forth of the virgins to meet the bridegroom, the tarrying, the slumbering and sleeping, the cry at midnight, the rising of the virgins, the entering in to the marriage, of those that are ready, the shutting



of the door, and the subsequent return of the foolish virgins, applying for admittance. Not to enter into an explanation of this parable, it must be evident to all, that, as applied to the history of the church under the proclamation of the advent, that point of time, and that event, corresponding to the shutting of the door in the parable, must be reached before the Saviour appears in the clouds of heaven to take his people to the marriage supper of the Lamb. For after the Lord has come, and taken his people to himself, and destroyed the wicked, no such thing can for a moment be supposed as the foolish virgins coming and seeking admittance. We must then have the shut door of the parable somewhere before the advent, and as that is all the shut door that is referred to by the visions, we now inquire, What event is illustrated by that portion of the parable? and what bearing has it upon the condition of the church and world? Our position, for which reasons can be given in full whenever occasion may require, is briefly this: Our Lord performs his ministry, as priest for the human race, in the sanctuary in Heaven. That work consists of two divisions: first, a ministration during the greater part of this dispensation in the first apartment of the sanctuary, or holy place, and second, a special work for a very short period in the second apartment, or most holy place. See works on the Sanctuary. During all his priestly work he is associated with his Father on the throne of universal dominion. Zech. vi, 12, 13; Eph. i, 20-22; Rev. iii, 21. At the close of his priestly work he delivers up this kingdom to God, and takes his own throne, "the throne of his father David," and reigns over the kingdom of his saints,

being himself subordinate only to God, the Father. 1 Cor. xv, 24-28. This reception of his own throne by the Saviour, is the marriage of the Lamb, it being received with the metropolis of his kingdom, the New Jerusalem, which is called "the mother of us all," and the "bride the Lamb's wife." Gal. iv, 26; Rev. xxi, 9, 10. This event, which constitutes the marriage, takes place at the close of his priestly work in the most holy place; Dan. vii, 13, 14; hence when he entered into that apartment to finish up his work as priest, it could be said of him that he had gone in to the marriage. When he goes in to the marriage, his saints are not personally with him; for they are not taken to Heaven till the time comes to participate in the marriage supper of the Lamb, which is, of course, subsequent to the marriage. Luke xii, 35-37; Rev. xix, 9. In the parable, it was when the bridegroom went in to the marriage that the door was shut. Christ changed his ministry from the holy to the most holy place, which was his going in to the marriage, at the close of the 2300 days, in the autumn of 1844. In what respect did this answer to the shutting of the door in the parable? In the typical sanctuary work of the former dispensation, when the high priest went into the most holy place on the day of atonement, the door of the holy place or first apartment was closed; and the door into the most holy, of course, opened. So in the sanctuary above. When the work in the most holy commenced, in 1844, the work in the outer apartment ceased. A new era, so to speak, was reached in the ministry of our Lord, involving a change in his relation to the world, nearly as great as that which took place when he entered upon his work in the first apart-



ment of the heavenly temple. A great testing truth, proclaimed among men, signalized upon earth the time of this change in the work in Heaven. Thousands upon thousands rejected this truth, and decided their cases for everlasting destruction; but those who had not thus shut up for themselves the way to life sustained the same relation to God as before; they might still approach to him through Christ, only they must now seek their Lord where he was to be found, and come to God through him in his new position.

We ask the especial attention of the reader to the principle involved in the argument at this point. It is this: A knowledge of Christ's position and work is necessary to the enjoyment of the benefits of his mediation. We cannot come to Christ for pardon and salvation, unless we understand that he has made these provisions for us. Not to understand his position and work, is of course to be deprived of his presence. When he ascended and commenced his ministration before God in behalf of mankind, it was necessary that the world should be apprised of that fact. Why? Because here was the only way to life. There was none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby they could be saved. The door was shut by the way of types and animal offerings, and the door was opened by way of a crucified Redeemer, then pleading in Heaven. But a general idea of his work was then sufficient to enable men to approach unto God by him. They might not understand the particulars of the sanctuary in Heaven, and just how he ministered as the anti-type of the earthly priesthood; but the great fact was recognized that he was there before God, as an intercessor for us, and that was sufficient. But

when he changed his position to the most holy place of the sanctuary, to perform the last division of his ministry as our great high priest, that knowledge of his work which had up to that point been sufficient, was no longer sufficient. The suppliant for the Lord's grace must follow him in his change of position, and come to him where he now pleads, before the ark of God's testament in the most holy place. When the apostles were sent forth to proclaim the great fact that Christ had passed into the Heavens, there to appear in the presence of God as an intercessor for us, that fact must be received and believed by the people, or they could have no interest in him. So when he changes his ministry, and the light upon it is sent forth, it is equally important that this additional fact be also recognized, that this truth be likewise received and acted upon. A knowledge of this change is further shown to be essential to the people, because the time during which he occupies this position is one of special solemnity, requiring special duties. Look at the type. When the high priest was in the most holy place, all Israel must know it, and must be gathered around the sanctuary, their minds being fixed upon his work, and they meanwhile afflicting their souls, that they might receive the benefits of the atonement, and not be cut off from the congregation of Israel. How much more necessary, in this great antitypical day of atonement, which is the living substance of which the former was but a shadow, that we understand the position and work of our great High Priest, and know the special duties required at our hand during this time. In the type, who were accepted on the day of atonement? Those who, in sympathy with their priest in his work of



atonement, were afflicting their souls. Who can find salvation now? Those who go to the Saviour where he is, and view him by faith in the most holy place, finishing his ministry before the ark of the testament in Heaven. This is the door now open for salvation. But no man can understand this change without definite knowledge of the subject of the sanctuary, and the relation of type and antitype. Hence the insufficiency of former views upon this subject, and the need of the special message, the third of Rev. xiv, which is based upon this special sanctuary work, and which is now being proclaimed in the ears of the people. Now they may reject this truth of the Saviour's special work in Heaven, as the light and proclamation goes forth upon it, and seek the Saviour as they have before sought him, with no other ideas of his position and ministry than those which they entertained while he was in the first apartment; but will it avail them? They cannot find him there. That door is shut.

But it may be inquired, What is the condition of those true Christians who have not yet become acquainted with this truth? Answer: The same as was that of Cornelius before Peter made known to him that remission of sins was to be had by believing in Jesus Christ. And should such be cut down by death before having an opportunity to learn the truth, they would of course be judged according to the light they had; for the third angel's message is, like all other truth, progressive, and people cannot be tested by it till they become, or have an opportunity to become, acquainted with it. But they who make a deliberate and final rejection of the truth, bring upon themselves blindness of mind and hardness of

heart, and shut up their only way to everlasting life. If this is not so, where is the importance of ever proclaiming a new truth, or the necessity of ever receiving it.

There must be some place for the application of such scriptures as Hos. v, 6: "They shall go with their flocks and with their herds, to seek the Lord, but they shall not find him; he hath withdrawn himself from them;" and at what time and to what people can this apply better than to the nominally Christian world, who, while having opportunity to learn the truth, have yet, since the Lord withdrew himself to the second apartment of the sanctuary in 1844, been seeking him where he is not to be found. There must be some importance attached to the message of the second angel, announcing that Babylon is fallen. That portion of the religious world so designated there met with a moral fall; and what can this mean but that God withdrew himself and his Spirit in a measure from them, because they rejected his truth, and refused to follow in its advancing light. He no longer acknowledges them, as a body, for his people. And on what ground shall we account for the rapid declension of piety and morality which is to take place in the last days, evil men and seducers waxing worse and worse, except it be that the world has departed from God, and that his Spirit is being withdrawn from the earth?

Now what are the representations of the visions in relation to this time? Do they teach a more exclusive shut door than Scripture facts and testimonies which we have presented? In their teachings we find such expressions as these: "I saw that Jesus finished his mediation in the holy place in 1844." "He has gone into the most holy,



where the faith of Israel now reaches." "His Spirit and sympathy are now withdrawn from the world, and our sympathy should be with him." "The wicked could not be benefited by our prayers now." "The wicked world whom God had rejected." "It seemed that the whole world was taken in the snare; that there could not be one left," (referring to Spiritualism.) "The time for their salvation is past."

These few expressions are all, or at least are the very strongest, in relation to what is called the shut door, that are claimed to have been given through any vision, either published or unpublished. Let us now inquire into their import. Let it be remembered that the question is, Do they teach that probation ceased in 1844, and that consequently there could be no true conversions after that time.

1. Christ's mediation in the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary ceased in 1844, and his mediation in the most holy commenced. This must be so, or our views of the sanctuary subject are all wrong; than which there is not a plainer doctrine in all the Bible. But probation does not cease with the cessation of Christ's work in the holy place; for Christ is an advocate in the most holy, as well as in the holy place; he pleads his blood in the second as well as in the first apartment of the sanctuary. See a conclusive argument on this point in Review, Vol. vii, No. 9. Pardon of sin may yet be found by those who will seek it upon the special conditions on which it is now based. This statement of the visions does not, therefore, assert the close of probation.

2. Christ is now in the most holy place, where he makes a special atonement for Israel, and where

the faith of Israel now reaches. The objection based upon this statement we suppose to be something like this: That as Christ in the most holy place only atones for Israel, and the faith of those only who constitute Israel reaches there, his work can consequently have reference to none but those who were open Christians at the time when he entered therein. The originators of this objection, to make it good, should show that no person could join himself to Israel, and become a true member of that body while the atonement is being made. This they not only have not done, but cannot do. While, on the contrary, it is shown by the general principles laid down above, and especially by the article there referred to, that to assume such a relation is not impossible during that time. Thus another effort to show that the visions teach the absolute close of probation, is shown to be futile.

3. The wicked world which God had rejected. It will be noticed that these expressions about the wicked are general. It is the wicked, the ungodly, the world, &c. They have reference to them as a whole, not as individuals. And they express simply the change of relation that took place between God and the world when the ministration of the sanctuary was changed from the holy to the most holy place. From the place where for 1800 years Christ had been found, he had now withdrawn. And when this change took place, was there any probability that the great mass, who had rejected light up to that point, would receive the advance truth, and seek God and the Saviour in this new relation? Not a particle. The light and truth moved on, and they were left behind. And if it is not to such circumstances as this that 2 Thess. ii, 10-12, has its application, then to what cases



does it or can it ever apply? Yet it would be true of individual cases that they would seek the Lord and be saved. As an exact parallel of this, we have the case of Babylon, mentioned in Rev. xiv and xviii. It is said, especially in Rev. xviii, that Babylon is fallen. This refers to people; for it is a fall into sin and corruption. Whenever this is fulfilled, Babylon as a whole has fallen, has become corrupt, and is guilty of outcries reaching up to Heaven. Yet this is not true of every individual in her connection. For when it is true of Babylon as a whole, that she is fallen, and sunk in sin, God's people are still within her communion; and another voice is heard from Heaven, saying, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Verse 4.

When Babylon falls, God's Spirit and sympathy are of course withdrawn from them, as a whole; yet it lingers with his people who are in her midst, and they are called out. So when the general ministration for the whole world ceases, God's Spirit and sympathy are withdrawn from them; but yet a final message of mercy, the third angel, is sent forth to give mankind a last warning, and gather out the few who may not be given over to hardness of heart, and may be willing to comply with the terms of the truth.

We have another forcible illustration of this point, in the case of the Jewish people. There came a time, as every one must admit, when the Jews, as a nation, were rejected of God. Christ became to them a stone of stumbling. They rejected the truth, and God left them. But was every member of that nation given over of God? No. The way was still open for individuals to

come to the Saviour and find mercy, and the apostles prayed, and preached, and wrote, for their brethren, their kinsmen according to the flesh, that they might be saved. There was a shut door in Paul's day, as well as in ours; not, of course, the shut door of the parable of the ten virgins, as that is given to illustrate the experience of the church in our day, not his. But there was a change of dispensation; and the old way of approaching to God which the Jews had had in the Levitical law, was closed up. They could no longer find even forgiveness in figure in that direction; and every individual of them must change his faith, and accept of the new truth then given, or he could not be saved. The first house of Israel, the Jews, stumbled at the doctrine of the first advent of the Saviour. The second house of Israel, Christians, have stumbled at the doctrine of the second advent, and have thus brought themselves into similar condemnation. This is the occasion of Babylon's fall. And when the call is made, Come out of her my people, those who reject that message, though not now partakers of her sins, thereby become such, and receive of her plagues. So we look upon the world, the mass of them being hopeless rejecters of the truth, but yet a few honest hearts remaining, for whose benefit the proclamation of the truth goes forth. This is not a subject over which to cavil. It is a thought of the most fearful solemnity that the great decisive day is so near, the way of salvation so straight, and so few now remaining who can be made to see it.

4. The whole world taken in the snare. This is spoken in relation to Spiritualism, as will be seen by the connection in which the expression occurs, on pp. 5-10 of the Supplement to Experi-



ence and Views. That any one should bring this forward to show that the visions teach that the destiny of every individual is decided, is simply astonishing. In that view, the whole career of Spiritualism is taken in at a glance. Our minds are carried right forward to the time when Satan will have power to bring up before us the appearance of our dead friends; a period yet future. Then why does any one apply it to the present time? Because in no other way could it serve his purpose. But there is no ground for such a conclusion. A paragraph on page 7 shows most conclusively that it applies to the future. Speaking of the saints at the time when it seemed that there were none left who were not taken in the snare of Spiritualism, it says: "This little company looked careworn, as though they had passed through severe trials and conflicts. And it appeared as if the sun had just appeared from behind the cloud and shone upon their countenances, and caused them to look triumphant, as though their victories were nearly won." This is a point not yet reached; and when we do reach it, we shall see Spiritualism bearing the sway here represented, in which it will seem that the whole world, with the exception of the little remnant church, are taken in its embrace. That Spiritualism is now fast taking the very position here assigned it, and drawing the whole world into its snare, is beginning to be evident; but no one dreamed of its ever assuming even its present proportions when that vision was given.

The progressive work, and the almost universal sway which Spiritualism is finally to bear, is set forth in Rev. xvi, 13, 14, where it is represented as coming forth from the mouths of the dragon,

beast, and false prophet, and going to the kings of the earth and the *whole world*. Before it can thus go forth, it must win its way to authority and power, a work which it is now fast accomplishing.

5. The time for their salvation is past. This expression occurs in the following paragraph, found on page 27 of Experience and Views: "I saw that the mysterious signs and wonders and false reformations would increase and spread. The reformations that were shown me, were not reformations from error to truth. My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked, but could not see it; for the time for their salvation is past." Whose salvation? Mark well, the scene of the vision is one of the false revivals of these last days. There are two classes of persons involved therein; namely, sinners, or non-professors, and the revivalists. Now which of these classes constitutes the leading subject of the view? If we can ascertain this, we can tell which class is referred to in the declaration, "The time for their salvation is past." The only reasonable construction that can be put upon the language, as well as the preceding testimony of the vision itself, shows as plainly as need be shown, that the false revivalists are the ones referred to, not sinners. See first paragraph of page 26: "I saw that Satan was working through agents in a number of ways. He was at work through *ministers* who have rejected the truth and are given over to strong delusions to believe a lie that they might be damned." These ministers are the ones referred to who are carrying on the false revivals brought to view. She was bade to look to see if



there was on their part, the travail for souls as used to be. She could not see it. Why? Because they, the ministers, had rejected the truth, and had been given over to believe a lie; the time for their salvation was past; and they could not feel that deep and genuine concern for souls that would be felt by those who stood in the counsel of God, and through whom he was working to bring sinners to himself. This plainly shows that the false revivalists, and not sinners in general, are the subject of that declaration.

Again, it makes the language inconsistent to apply it to sinners. For if it means that there is no travail of soul for sinners in these revivals, because there was no salvation for sinners, it follows inevitably that if there had been salvation for sinners, there would have been travail of soul for them, on the part of those who were carrying on these false revivals. But these persons were ministers who were given over to strong delusions for rejecting the truth; and there would be no reason at all in supposing that such ones would have real travail of soul for sinners, however much hope of salvation those sinners might have. It cannot therefore refer to sinners in general, but only to a particular class of rejected professors. Thus a little honest inquiry frees the subject from all difficulty.

But it is still insisted that grammar will not allow of any other construction; that the pronoun *their* must refer to sinners. Then let us take an instance from the Bible. In 2 Sam. xxiv, 1, we read: "And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and *he* moved David against them to say, Go number Israel and Judah." In 1 Chron. xxi, 1, the very same circumstance is

given in the following language: "And *Satan* stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel." Now says the infidel, here is a contradiction in the Bible; for it is plainly said here in Chronicles that Satan moved David to number Israel; but in Samuel it is said that the Lord did it; for the pronoun *he* refers to the Lord right before it. Well, so far as grammatical construction is concerned, it does refer to it, even more directly than the pronoun "*their*" refers to "*sinners*" in the quotation given from the visions. And with the same unreasonable and dogged pertinacity, our opponents are bound to insist that the pronoun *he* in 2 Sam. xxiv, refers to the Lord before it, that grammar won't admit of any other construction, &c., which they manifest in relation to the language of the vision. This, we say, they must do, to be consistent. But in this case what are they doing? Openly taking their stand with the infidel and proving a contradiction in the Bible. This is the way infidels attack the Bible; and this is the way our opponents attack the visions. Their arguments rest on the same basis, and run exactly parallel to each other. But both are mistaken; for the context in both cases demands a different understanding from that which the evil-disposed insist is involved in the construction of the language. In 2 Sam. xxiv, we refer the pronoun "*he*" to an antecedent understood, namely, Satan, because the parallel passage in 1 Chron. plainly requires this. So in the vision, we refer the pronoun "*their*" to the movers in these false revivals, because the whole intent and scope of the language which precedes it, requires this understanding of the passage. And let our opponents say no more about grammar,



unless they are prepared to go with the infidel on 2 Sam. xxiv, 1.

We may further add that this vision was fully explained in the Supplement to Experience and Views, p. 4, where it is stated that the expression, "The time for their salvation is past," has reference to those who were carrying on the false revivals, who were given over to strong delusion, and who consequently did not have travail of soul for sinners as formerly. And besides all this, this whole subject was explained in Review, Vol. xix, No. 8.

Of all these things, those who have risen up in fierce array against the visions, were not, and are not, ignorant. Yet with a blindness that is unaccountable, or a degree of dishonesty that is unpardonable, they make the unqualified assertion that the visions here teach that since 1844, there has been no salvation for sinners! They here teach no such thing, and those who assert it will be subjects of the pity or censure of the unprejudiced reader, accordingly as their course is to be attributed to a lack of mental ability to understand the language, or a detestable disposition which would willfully pervert it.\*

That what this vision represents is true of a class of individuals, we have no doubt. We believe there are thousands upon thousands throughout the land, whose day of grace is closed, and for whom there remains only a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation. Unless some such

\*This language will not seem any too severe, when it is stated that at the Marion (Iowa) meeting, in the summer of 1865, as we are informed upon the best authority, this whole subject was explained to Messrs. Snook and Brinkerhoff, and they admitted that their objections were removed, and professed themselves entirely satisfied.

change as this did take place in 1844, our application of the second message of Rev. xiv, is entirely wrong. And that there was some sudden decline in the moral condition of the masses, would seem to be equally proved by the fact that in less than a score of years from that time, Spiritualism, openly scouting the Bible and blaspheming God, had made its millions of converts to a system composed of the silliest trash, and reeking with the most disgusting licentiousness, that has ever disgraced our fallen humanity.

We have seen that what is said in the visions of the apostate and rejected state of the world, is expressed in general terms, referring to it as a whole, and not to individual cases. But during the same time that these expressions apply to the world, the visions do speak of individual cases; and in these instances they show conclusively that probation has not absolutely ceased. See, for instance, Experience and Views, p. 19: "Then I saw that Jesus would not leave the most holy place *until* every case was *decided* for salvation or destruction." Apply this to whatever class we will, it shows that the time during which Christ is in the most holy place, is a time of decision of character; and that consequently all characters were not decided when he entered therein. And, should any one say that that referred only to those who were Christians at the time when he entered into that apartment, then it would at once appear that the cases even of such were not finally decided, or, in other words, that there was danger of their falling away. But so long as saints can fall away, sinners can be converted; for, when probation ceases, and the cases of all are decided, and there can be no more conversions among sinners, then there can be no more



apostasies among saints. When it is said, Let him that is filthy, be filthy still, it is also said, Let him that is holy, be holy still.

Again, on pp. 24 and 25, of Experience and Views, we have a vision of the open and shut door. This plainly sets forth the fact, that when the door of the holy place of the sanctuary in Heaven was closed, the door into the most holy place was opened, and since that time, the commandments have been shining out to God's people, and they are being tested on the Sabbath question. Now compare this with the claim that all cases were decided when Christ entered the most holy place in 1844. Since then the Sabbath has been a test to God's people. What is the object of a test? How can you test a person whose case is already decided? Testing a man whose character is fixed, and who is consequently beyond the necessity or reach of tests! This is as bad as the conscious-state-of-the-dead theory, which has millions of the saints in Heaven for long ages before the Judgment takes place to decide whether they are worthy of that place or not! A point so plain as this could not have been overlooked by any one who had examined the visions with any care and attention. This shows that their opponents have never candidly studied them to learn what they did teach; but in their eagerness to break down their testimony, they have been ready to rank themselves among the unenviable characters whom Jude describes, and speak evil of the things which they know not.

So far therefore as individual cases are concerned, the visions do positively teach that there are some, how many we of course know not, whose probation has not yet ceased, but who are yet to

be converted to God, or sealed to destruction. It is for us, therefore, to herald abroad to the fullest extent we are able, the final note of mercy and warning, praying God in his providence to guide the good seed of truth to the few honest hearts that remain, wherever they are, that the remnant may be brought out who will be prepared to meet the King of kings at his appearing and kingdom. But for the world, the wicked in general, we cannot pray. Our prayers could neither reach nor benefit them. Their hearts are hopelessly closed against the reception of the truth, by which alone people can be sanctified and saved. And though we should pray for them till the Saviour appeared, their adamantine casing of prejudice would not be broken, nor their ears open to the slightest word of truth, nor their hearts weaned from the gross idols of pleasure and sin upon which they are set.

We have now examined all the expressions which are brought forward to show that the visions teach the close of probation in 1844, with the exception of one which we shall examine in connection with objection eight. We have shown that they teach no such doctrine as our opponents accuse them of teaching.

And right here we wish to nail to the wall, a falsehood which is very glibly circulated about us in reference to the subject under consideration. And we may as well advertise the reader now, as at any future time, that this is a commodity in which our opponents deal to a greater or less extent according to their degree of hatred against the visions. The more intensely they hate them, the more deliberately and unscrupulously they will misrepresent them and their advocates. The particular statement we take occasion here to deny is



the following: "Ellen's visions once taught the shut-door theory. If they are right now, were they not correct then? But she and her party now discard the very theory that was once taught in her visions. This is a fact." If the reverend (?) gentleman who penned this paragraph, had made his last sentence read, This is a lie, instead of This is a fact, he would have uttered the exact truth, instead of a lie. We deny the whole statement. We discard nothing that the visions have ever taught from beginning to end, from first to last. Whenever we give up any, we shall give up all; so let this point be once for all distinctly understood.

OBJECTION 5.—DURATION OF CHRIST'S MINISTRY IN THE MOST HOLY PLACE.

The point next in importance in the catalogue of the objector, is the duration of Christ's final work in the second apartment of the sanctuary in Heaven. It is claimed that when his ministry had progressed therein but five years, from 1844 to 1849, the visions declared that his time to remain there was more than half expired; hence that according to the visions, he should have come long ago; and as he has not come, the visions are, in the pure vernacular of these new objectors, a "*deceptive cheat!*" The language upon which this objection is based, is found on page 46 of *Experience and Views*, as follows: "I saw that the time for Jesus to be in the most holy place was nearly finished, and that time cannot last but a very little longer." We are accustomed, when investigating Bible questions, to let one portion of the Bible explain another. Why may we not follow the same

rule in reference to the visions, and let one portion of them explain another? According to this rule, the declaration that the time for Jesus to be in the most holy place was nearly finished, is explained by the sentence that immediately follows, namely, "*Time cannot last but a very little longer.*" See also near the top of page 47: "The sealing time is *very short*, and soon will be over." When is the sealing time? It synchronizes exactly with the period during which Christ ministers in the most holy place. Well, that time is very short, and soon will be over; in other words, the time for Christ to minister in the most holy place, will soon be finished. The burden of this testimony, then, is the shortness of time, and the very little space that is occupied by the sealing work and the cleansing of the sanctuary.

Mark this. The idea of *comparison* between the time that Jesus had then been in the most holy place, and the time he was to continue there, is *not introduced*. The objector presents it as if the comparison was there, because in no other way does it afford the slightest ground for an objection. But it is not so expressed. It does not read, "I saw that the time for Jesus to be in the most holy place, *in comparison with the time during which he has already been there*, is nearly finished." But it would have to read so, before we should have any right to infer that his time there was then more than half or three-quarters finished, as is claimed. The vision looks from the point at which it is given, out to the end, and in that direction only, and declares that the work is nearly finished. As we sincerely believe and understand it, the view is designed to impress upon the mind of the



reader, simply the shortness of time and the nearness of the end.

And is not what is there shown, true as a matter of fact? Is not time almost finished? We appeal to every believer in the near advent. Could it have been truthfully expressed in any other manner? What should we have thought of a vision which had told us that his time in the most holy was *not* almost finished? And considering the shortness of his ministry in that apartment, would it not be true at any period of its progress, looking *from that point out to the end*, that it was nearly finished? There is an expression in James, stronger than any in this vision, which we believe was true in 1844, has been true ever since, and still is true: "Behold the Judge standeth before the door."

OBJECTION 6.—LOOKING TOO FAR OFF FOR THE  
COMING OF THE LORD.

On page 46 of Experience and Views, we read, "I saw some looking too far off for the coming of the Lord. Time has continued a few years longer than they expected; therefore they think it may continue a few years more, and in this way their minds are being led from present truth, out after the world." This vision was given about 1849; and the opponent endeavors to transform it into an objection by the following very luminous comment: "The only time movement then in agitation was the 1854 movement; and as that has passed by, this vision is not of God." Oh, profundity of logic! Supposing this to have reference to some definite time, was it not even just possible that some were looking to a time later than 1854? It is a notorious fact that even from

the first, later times have been set by many. But this testimony does not have reference to any definite time at all. The very language shows that it is indefinite. Some were putting off the coming of the Lord indefinitely, and so were being led away into the world. Was it the result of the '54 time movement, or can it be of any such movement, to lead its believers into the world? No; those who advocate such moves, while so doing, must so far separate themselves from the world, as to have their lives outwardly at least correspond to their profession. This view had reference to commandment-keepers, and was given to warn them of the danger of saying in their hearts, *My Lord delayeth his coming, and so being overcome by the spirit of the world.* "Then," says one, "the Lord should have come, according to that, in at most, three or four years from that time." That does not follow. If the Lord was not coming for twenty years, it would not be safe for the church to look forward, indefinitely, half that distance for the event. By thus putting it off indefinitely, we lose the spirit of the doctrine entirely; and as a consequent, the spirit of the world comes in to take its place. In no other way do we believe that the church can be prepared for the trials they are to endure, and finally be ready for the Lord when he comes, but to be expecting and watching for the event as nigh at hand. Therefore we say, Do not put off the coming of the Lord. See to it that this great event does not become dim in the distance before your eyes. And this is simply what this vision teaches on this point.

We close our answer to this objection with the following incident, which lately occurred in the



experience of one of our preachers, and which forcibly illustrates the point before us:

"The boat stopped at the wharf to wood. Passengers stood on the wharf with satchels in hand, ready to step aboard as soon as the plank was lowered. They feared to lose a moment lest they should be left behind. Those on board asked the captain how long he would stop there. "Just long enough to wood," he said. At first the passengers dare not hardly go a rod from the boat lest it should go and leave them; but as the boat stayed longer than they expected, at the end of the first hour they ventured to the nearest groceries. Another hour passed, and they began to think that they would have time to see the town, and perhaps trade a little. A third hour passed, and yet the boat did not go. They were now tired of waiting, and their fears of being left were all gone. They began to think how they might amuse themselves to pass away the time; for this purpose they began to wander, one here and another there, and some a good ways from the boat.

"Meanwhile the boat was being loaded. Every hour and every minute brought it nearer the time to start. At length the last stick was on, the whistle blew, and the command was given, 'Haul in the lines and take up the plank.' Then there was hurrying and running to get aboard. Some who were the farthest off had to jump on after the plank was hauled in, some had to climb over the bow of the boat, and some who had wandered the farthest, were left entirely.

"Dear reader, do you see the application of this? To my mind it is very evident. When we first heard the good news that Christ was soon coming, we felt that we had no time to lose to get ready

for that event. Time appeared very short. We were anxious to do all we could to be ready at any moment. But as with the passengers, so with us; time has continued longer than we expected. With some, it seems to grow further off every year, and we are growing more careless and less watchful about his coming. Some are becoming worldly minded, are wandering far from the Lord. But be careful, be careful. Every year and every day brings the actual hour of his coming so much nearer. Soon the trumpet will sound, and Jesus will appear. Then it will be too late to come back to the Lord. Let us watch and be sober, and not wander from the Lord, whilst yet a few days of preparation remain."

#### OBJECTION 7.—NEW CONVERTS.

In a vision given June 27, 1850, Experience and Views, page 55, we read as follows concerning new converts to the truth: "But now time is almost finished, and what we have been years learning, they will have to learn in a few months." "Then," says the objector, "the Lord should have come in a few months from that time." Not at all. The view, as is evident from the testimony commencing on the middle of the preceding page, is showing what a preparation the people of God must have, to endure the suffering they would have to meet for Christ's sake, and escape the seven last plagues. The tenor of the vision is shown by such expressions as these: "Will ye shun the seven last plagues? If so, ye must die that ye may live. Get ready, get ready. Ye must have a greater preparation than ye now have. Ye must be partakers of Christ's sufferings here, if ye



would be partakers with him of his glory hereafter."

"I saw that some of us have had time to get the truth, and to advance *step by step*, and every step we have taken has *given us strength* to take the next." Then follows the sentence first quoted: "But now time is almost finished, and what we have been years learning, they will have to learn in a few months."

Now the strength we gain by our experience as we journey on, is just proportioned to the draft that will be made upon it by the conflicts and trials before us.

That is, we need at any time all the strength that we have up to that time gained. And at no time is it true of any of us, that we have acquired *more* strength than we need to be able to stand. As time elapses, we meet heavier conflicts, and closer tests are brought to bear upon us. We can now easily see how it must be with new converts in any of the advanced stages of our progress. What those of longer standing have been learning by years of experience, and so have just acquired strength for future progress, new converts, in order to come up to the same degree of capability of endurance, as it is necessary that they should do, in order to stand, must learn in a very short space of time. And this will be more and more emphatically the case, as we draw nearer and nearer to the end.

Again, we find in the Bible declaration after declaration, put in the present tense, but yet having no reference to the time in which they were written, but only to some future time, when they would be specially applicable. See for instance the following: "The end of all things is at hand."

"Him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead." "The Judge standeth before the door." "We shall not all sleep." "We which are alive and remain;" &c. 1 Pet. iv, 5, 7; James v, 9; 1 Cor. xv, 51; 1 Thess. iv, 15; declarations which applied, not to the generation then living, but to people eighteen hundred years from that time. But no believer in the Bible ever thinks of objecting to it, on account of this testimony. Why? Because they understand the principle that a person in vision, or writing under the influence of the Spirit of God, is frequently carried forward into the future, and speaks from that stand-point as though the time was then present. Just apply the same principle to the case before us, and the objection vanishes at once, and all is harmonious and plain.

#### OBJECTION 8.—THE DEVIL IN HEAVEN.

The objector further says of the visions: "They teach that the Devil is in Heaven, trying to carry on the work of God." The view upon which this foolish and wicked misrepresentation is based, is found in Experience and Views, pages 43, 44. It is a view of events to occur at the end of the 2300 days, when Jesus changed his position from the holy to the most holy place. The Advent people, the church and the world, were represented as bowed before the throne. A great light was shed forth from the throne over the whole multitude; but only a few would receive it. This we understand to be the great light that came forth upon the doctrine of the advent under the first angel's message. When Jesus rose up from the throne, or changed his position to the most holy place, those



who had received the light and were standing in his counsel, rose up with him, or followed him by faith in the change that he then made. The other portion of the company who had refused the light, were thereby left in ignorance of the change that had been made, and maintained their former position. They were as a consequence, left in darkness. The true light was now shining from another quarter. Not a ray of light was seen to pass to the multitude who still remained where they had stubbornly refused the light that had been tendered to them. This represents the position of the professed church and the world. And that it is their position we believe as firmly to-day as we ever did. And more than this, all other classes of Adventists regard them in the same light. What Adventist would think of looking to the world or the nominal churches for light? Not one. They know that they have not the light, but are in error and darkness just as the vision represents them to be. Concerning present truth and present duty, they are in total darkness, and they will remain so, just as long as they persist in occupying their present position. They must be willing to move on with the truth, or there is no more light for them. And this, aside from this controversy on the visions, every Adventist will admit. But God still has a people there, who will yet come out where the light is shining, and rejoice in its sanctifying influence.

Then Satan was represented as standing by the throne which Jesus had left, endeavoring to act in his stead, when the multitude sent up their blind petitions, and to affect them in a way to deceive them, and thus best suit his own purposes. From this it is claimed that Satan is seen to be in Heaven;

and they then facetiously ask if he is "not in the wrong place for him!" How soon their joy at this discovery would all have been spoiled, if they had taken the trouble to think but a step further. If this vision teaches that the Devil is in Heaven, then, mark, it teaches that the Advent people, *the churches* and *the world* are all in Heaven! for these were all represented as bowed right before the same throne, by the side of which Satan was represented as standing; not on which he was said to be sitting, as they falsely assert. But who in his sober senses can be induced to believe that it teaches any such thing as this! Neither does it any more teach that Satan is in Heaven. Any one can see that the representation is simply designed to show the relation that existed between Christ and the world, the change that took place in that relation when he changed his ministration, and how Satan steps in and endeavors to perform the office of a bestower of blessings upon those who have refused the light, in order to render still more complete their willful deception. And who has not seen this verified? In all the false revivals of the land, is there not ample evidence that they were carried on by an influence other than the Spirit of God?

#### OBJECTION 9.—THE TIME OF TROUBLE COMMENCED.

It is alleged that it was shown in vision, in 1849, that the time of trouble had commenced. The authority given is some expressions taken down as uttered in vision. Such detached declarations we cannot admit as proof of anything positive, because we do not know with what scenes they were connected in the vision, and hence are unable to



locate them. We must have the whole vision with all its connections, and dependencies. For the sake, however, of not seeming to pass anything by without due consideration, we will admit the possibility of certain declarations having been made; and of their having reference to the time when they were spoken. The alleged expressions are these: "The time of trouble has commenced, it is begun. The reason why the four winds have not let go, is because the saints are not all sealed. It is on the increase, and will increase more and more. The trouble will never end till the earth is rid of the wicked. When Michael stands up, this trouble will be all over the earth." Now what is proved by these expressions? It is proved that the special time of trouble such as never was, had *not* then commenced; for that does not take place till Michael stands up, according to Dan. xii, 1; but the expression here is, "*When* Michael stands up this trouble will be all over the earth;" showing that Michael had not then stood up, and that the trouble referred to was only some local and particular trouble. Again, "The reason why the four winds have not let go," &c. This again shows that the great time of trouble which is to be caused by the blowing of the winds had not then commenced. The word trouble is then used only in a secondary sense; and in that sense it was true, and still is true. The great outbreak in Europe, in 1848, marked the commencement of that time designated as the "anger of the nations." Rev. xi, 18. Since then they have been growing more and more angry. Distress of nations with perplexity has been increasing on the earth; and darker forebodings press more heavily continually on the hearts of men, just as the Saviour said it

should be, when giving the signs of his coming. Within the past seventeen years every Adventist has reiterated all these things more than a thousand times; and we ask, Are they true or false? Now, shall we grow angry because it happened to be so seen in vision, and give it all up, although it has thus far been a cardinal point of our faith?

#### OBJECTION 10.—PERPETUATION OF IMMORTALITY.

On this point the objector says: "She teaches, contrary to the Bible on the subject of immortality, that even the endless life in the eternal state may cease and waste away." We reply, She teaches no such thing; and they who assert it, do, or might, know better. To what do they refer for proof of this? To what she says about *Adam* in the garden of Eden: "In order for *man* to possess an endless life, he must continue to eat of the tree of life. Deprived of that tree, *his* life would gradually wear out." Gifts, Vol. iii, p. 64. This is spoken of Adam in his probationary state in Paradise. But we would inform our astute reasoners that Adam on probation in the garden of Eden, and a redeemed saint in glory, are two things. This declaration has no reference to the eternal state. Could they not see this? Or is it their pleasure to pervert and misrepresent? Their conclusion is six thousand years from their premises; and if this is a specimen of their discernment in opposing the visions, the sooner they retire from the arena the better for their reputation as candid reasoners, or even honest men.



## OBJECTION 11.—SLAVERY.

The objector consoles himself again with the thought that here is something more out of joint with the visions. He says: "Her visions on slavery in the United States have been proven false by recent facts." To which we reply, that recent facts have proved no such thing. The only declaration that referred to slavery at the time it was written is this: "It looked to me like an impossibility now for slavery to be done away." This was shown in 1862, and published in Testimony No. 7, page 19. It was spoken in reference to the South as their selfish love of slavery was set before her in vision, and the desperate measures they would adopt to preserve the institution, before they would give it up. To illustrate this case, she was pointed back to Pharaoh and his dealings with the Israelites as they came out of Egypt. And as the scene passed before her and she saw the fiendish spirit of the slaveholders, and their unscrupulous determinations, she says it looked to her like an impossibility for slavery to be done away. Well now, could not slavery be done away without proving it false that it at that time *appeared* to her that such a thing was impossible? Is it on such shallow objections as this, that we are called upon to give up the visions? But it does not yet appear that slavery is really dead. Men of quite as much erudition and scope of discernment as any who are now engaged in a petty warfare against the visions, assert and reiterate, from personal knowledge of things in the South, that slavery is as much a fact to-day, in some portions of those States, as it was five years ago; that it is abolished only in name. It is beginning to *look* even to some of these, like

an impossibility, under the present state of things, for it to be done away.

But there is another testimony that is brought in, in this connection. Experience and Views, page 18: "Then commenced the Jubilee when the land should rest. I saw the pious slave rise in triumph and victory, and shake off the chains that bound him, while his wicked master was in confusion, and knew not what to do; for the wicked could not understand the voice of God. Soon appeared the great white cloud," &c. But how, we would like to know, is this "proved to be false by the recent events in the United States?" It cannot be proved to be false till we have passed the time to which it applies; and when is that? It is right down at the end, at the voice of God, in close connection with the appearing of the Saviour. And, we inquire further, even if slavery in this country should be, for the time being, entirely abolished, as we trust and pray that it may be, that the poor bondman may have an opportunity to learn the truth, would it not be possible for it to be revived again before the coming of the Lord? At that time the world will be sunk to an unparalleled degree in every species of wickedness; and can we suppose that the system of slavery, which so panders to all the grosser lusts of the depraved and carnal heart, will be unknown in the midst of that wickedness? Will men become so extremely virtuous on this point? It is not at all probable. If we understand this vision aright, and Rev. vi, 15 aright, there will be bondmen on the earth when the Lord appears.



## OBJECTION 12.—THE SABBATH A TEST.

"She teaches," says the objector, "that the Sabbath was not a test prior to 1844, which is contrary to the Bible." To this we reply, that she teaches no such thing. What does she say? "I saw that the *present test* on the Sabbath could not come until the mediation of Jesus in the Holy Place was finished, and he had passed within the second vail; therefore Christians who fell asleep before the door was opened in the Most Holy when the midnight cry was finished at the seventh month, 1844, and had not kept the true Sabbath, now rest in hope; for they had not the light and the test on the Sabbath which *we now* have since that door was opened." Experience and Views, page 25. Then what is the test referred to? Evidently the new light that came forth at that time upon the Sabbath question *as connected with prophecy*. But the objector; by making the Sabbath a test in the same sense in which it is now a test, before the development of the light upon it, not only goes beyond the Bible, but offers no hope to those Christians who have died in the past without observing it. If he wishes to take upon himself that burden he is welcome to carry it. The Bible proportions a man's responsibility to the light he receives. And what is it that gives the Sabbath doctrine its vitality and aggressive power in the hands of S. D. Adventists, over what it possesses in the hands of S. D. Baptists? It is simply its connection with prophecy and the subject of the sanctuary. And before the truth on these subjects came out, the light that existed on the Sabbath question, even among those who were observing it, was scarcely a tithe of what it is now. Hence

the Sabbath question has occupied a place before the world since that time, such as it did not, and could not, before. No S. D. Adventist can consistently deny this. And this is all that can be deduced from the teachings of the visions upon this point.

## OBJECTION 13.—THE ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY FOUR THOUSAND.

"Her visions," we are told, "are contradictory in regard to the 144,000." The only trouble with this objection is, that like all those we have thus far examined, it is false. There is no truth in it. What is the objection made of? Just this. In Experience and Views, page 11, she speaks of the living saints at the time the voice of God is heard, as being 144,000 in number. In Gifts, Vol. i, page 203, she says that those who have died in faith under the third angel's message, are raised at the voice of God. She does not say that these raised ones are numbered among the 144,000, as the objector assumes; but we will consider it so, in order to give the objection all the force that it can have. Then, says the objector, the first statement that the 144,000 are the living saints, is contradicted by the second that it takes these resurrected ones to make up the number. Will the objector tell us when these persons are raised? Is it the voice of God pronouncing the day and hour of Jesus' coming, that brings them up, or do they come up before, and in season to hear it? This point is conclusively settled by the testimony in immediate connection. We read on the page last referred to: "There was a mighty earthquake. The graves were shaken open, and those



who died in faith under the third angel's message, keeping the Sabbath, came forth from their dusty beds, glorified, *to hear* the covenant of peace that God was to make with those who had kept his law." What this covenant of peace is, is shown a few lines further on: "And as God spake the day and hour of Jesus' coming and delivered the everlasting covenant to his people," &c. Now what can be meant by the declaration that they came forth *to hear* the covenant of peace, &c., unless it is that they are raised before this covenant is proclaimed, or the voice of God announces the day and hour of Jesus' coming, and are raised in order to hear it. Then having been raised, and standing alive with the saints who have never died, are they not in all propriety reckoned among the living saints? And it is this very declaration of the day and the hour of Jesus' coming that the company then alive, 144,000 in number, hear and understand. Experience and Views, pages 10, 11. Then where is the contradiction? It does not exist.

But it is further objected, that at the general resurrection of the righteous at the appearing of Christ, the 144,000 rejoice to meet their friends who had been torn from them by death. Experience and Views, page 12. This is claimed as a contradiction. But is it not barely possible that some of the 144,000 had Christian friends taken away by death previous to the rise of the third angel's message? Such captious criticism is unworthy of notice.

It is objected again that this makes too many resurrections. We leave the objector to settle this with the Bible; for the prophet Daniel brings to view this very resurrection. Dan. xii, 1, 2: "And

at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

Here is a resurrection which takes place after the great and final time of trouble for this world has commenced. But it is not the general resurrection either of the righteous or the wicked; for it is only "some" out of each class; not all of either class. Hence here is a resurrection of a certain number of righteous ones, before the general resurrection of the righteous, at the appearing of Christ; for there will be no possibility of this partial resurrection after that event; and coming in as it does, after the time of trouble commences, and before the appearing of Christ in the clouds of heaven, it must be the very resurrection here brought to view in the visions. To no other event can Daniel's testimony apply.

#### OBJECTION 14.—FLEEING OUT OF THE VILLAGES.

The view presented in the visions, of the saints fleeing out of the cities and villages in the time of trouble, Ex. and Views, p. 17, is contrary to Luke xvii, 34, 35, which speaks of two men being in one bed, two women grinding at the mill, and one being taken and the other left. In what respect the vision is contrary to Luke xvii, 34, 35, this crude and half-stated objection does not inform us. We are



left to infer that in the objector's view two are to be in bed, two women grinding at the mill, two in the field, &c., at the moment when Christ appears and sends his angels to gather his saints; one is to be righteous, and so is to be "taken" up to meet the Lord, and the other is to be wicked, and so left to perish; in other words, the righteous and wicked are to be mingled together promiscuously over the earth and separated at the coming of Christ; whereas the visions show that the righteous separate themselves from the wicked before that time, and gather together in companies waiting for the Lord. The objection is founded simply upon the objector's view of the passage referred to, in the correctness of which, we have not the slightest confidence in a single particular. Hence we cannot well answer the objection, short as it is, without giving an exposition of the scripture involved therein. And as an explanation of this important passage may be of interest, aside from the use the objector would make of it against the visions, the reader will pardon us for dwelling upon it quite at length.

The verses in question, Luke xvii, 34-36, read as follows: "I tell you, in that night, there shall be two men in one bed; the one shall be taken and the other left. Two women shall be grinding together; the one shall be taken and the other left. Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken and the other left."

Two classes of persons are here brought to view, probably the righteous and the wicked, between which there is, at some time, a separation to take place. We wish to ascertain, if possible, when this time is, or at what period this portion of Scripture has its application. To do this we must

look at the context, to which we invite the attention of the reader, commencing with verse 26: "And as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. 27. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all. 28. Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; 29; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from Heaven, and destroyed them all. 30. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed. 31. In that day, he which shall be upon the housetop, and his stuff in the house, let him not come down to take it away: and he that is in the field let him likewise not return back. 32. Remember Lot's wife. 33. Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it."

Following these verses, come the ones first introduced. The proposition we first undertake to prove in reference to this scripture, is, that it does not apply to the precise moment when the glorious light of the coming Saviour flashes like the lightning from the east to the west, nor to any particular hour, nor to any day of twenty-four hours, but to a period of time more or less indefinite. But does it not say, "In the *day* when the Son of man is revealed," and "in that *day*," and even "in that *night*?" True; and some argue from this, apparently incapable of looking at the subject from more than one point of view, that the particular day of twenty-four hours in which Christ appears must be all that is referred to in the passage. But



if we shall show that these expressions are sometimes used to denote an indefinite period, and that the context positively requires that they should be so used here, it will be sufficient to establish our proposition, with all reasonable and candid minds. And this can easily be done.

1. The definition of these words will allow us to give them such an application. Greenfield, under the word day (*ἡμέρα*) says that by metonymy the word is used both in the singular and plural to denote "time," as measured by days, as in the phrase, in our days; life, that is, time of life, age, years." Under the word night, (*νύξ*), he says, "Tropically, a time which is unsuitable, unseasonable, inopportune for doing anything. By metonymy, a time of mental darkness, ignorance, and vice."

2. The word is frequently so used in the New Testament. Luke vi, 22, 23: "Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy." Not in a day, merely of twenty-four hours, but in a time, a season, when such should be their experience. Luke x, 12: "But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom, than for that city." Verse 14 shows that this is the day of Judgment; and no one can suppose that by this a day of merely twenty-four hours is meant, but a period of time in which the Judgment sits, and the punishment is determined and executed upon the unrepentant and guilty. John viii, 56: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it and was glad." Not simply a literal day in Christ's

history, but doubtless the whole period of his ministry upon earth. Rom. xiii, 12: "The night is far spent, the day is at hand." Here, certainly, something more than a period of twenty-four hours is meant. 1 Thess. v, 2: "The day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." But we all know that the day of the Lord is more than a literal day in duration; and that it commences with the judgments that fall upon the earth a short period before the appearing of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven. See Isa. xiii, 6-13; lxiii, 1-6; Zeph. i, 14-18; 2 Pet. iii, 10, 12; Rev. xv, 1; xvi, 1-21; &c. Again we read, "Behold now is the day of salvation;" 2 Cor. vi, 2; referring to the whole gospel dispensation; the "day" when God took Israel by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, Heb. viii, 9, covering all the time consumed in fully delivering them from the house of bondage; the "day of temptation," Heb. iii, 8, 9, 17, in which God was grieved with them forty years; &c. That the word night is used in a similar sense is shown by Rom. xiii, 12, already quoted, and by John ix, 4; "The night cometh when no man can work."

These instances might be multiplied to almost any required extent. And although neither these, nor the definitions above given, would, of themselves, prove positively that the word day has an indefinite meaning in the passage under consideration, they show that it *may* be so used, and that such *must* be its meaning here, if there is anything in the context to require it.

We are now ready to look still further at verses 26-30, and show that a space of time, more or less indefinite, and not the precise moment at which the Lord appears, is referred to therein through-



out. Verse 24 declares, "As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the *days* of the Son of man." Here the plural, *days*, is used, showing that a period of some considerable length is intended. And so far as time is concerned, this is the key-note to the whole passage. The mind is set right in the very start. And the expression, "the day when the Son of man is revealed," of verse 30, and "that day," of verse 31, and "that night," of verse 34, evidently mean the same as "the *days* of the Son of man," of verse 26; for all the expressions refer to the very same time. The parallel passage in Matt. xxiv, 37-41, reads, "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be," &c. Now there can be no just comparison between the days of Noah, and the act of coming again on the part of the Son of man. Hence, this is not what is intended. But there can be a comparison between the days of Noah, the days that preceded the flood, and the days that immediately precede the coming of the Son of man; and this consideration is sufficient to show that this is what is meant. And in this time there shall be a separation, or line of distinction drawn, between the righteous and the wicked; for two shall "be in the field; the one shall be taken and the other left;" and "two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken and the other left."

The reference to the days of Noah covers a period of time during which they were eating, drinking, marrying, scoffing at Noah, and giving themselves up to revelry and riot. To be a parallel case, a period of time must also be referred to in the last days, sufficient for these traits of evil to

be developed and glaringly practiced among mankind.

Verse 31 says, "In that day, he which shall be upon the housetop, and his stuff in the house, let him not come down to take it away." This language is adapted to the customs of the country in which it was spoken, where the roofs of the houses are flat and so near together that a person can step without difficulty from the roof of one house to another, and so, in case of danger, could even escape from the city without coming down at all into the street. It must simply mean that in the time here spoken of, no one should give himself any concern to save his earthly goods and possessions. But let us apply it, as some would have us do, to the moment when the Lord appears, and we ask, where then would be the necessity of such an exhortation as this? Who at that time will be looking to his wealth and riches? No one; for before this time the cankered gold of the miser will be cast into the streets, Eze. vii, 19, and the great ones of the earth, knowing from the convulsions of nature, even before the Lord makes his appearance, that the great day of his wrath is come, Rev. vi, 15, 16, drop all their earthly possessions, flee to the mountains, and lift up a frantic prayer to the rocks and mountains, to bury them from the wrath of the Lamb, and from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne, the revelation of whose awful presence they momentarily expect. It is not, therefore, consistent to apply the language of verse 31 to the literal day of twenty-four hours, in which the Lord appears. It must cover a longer period of time, and have its application previous to that event.

Verse 23 reads, "Whosoever shall seek to save



his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it." The attempt to apply this language to the very day of the Lord's appearing, will present in a still stronger light the absurdity of that view. For we ask, How will a man at the moment of the Lord's coming, as a *result* of seeking to save his life, lose it? And how will he, at that point of time, *by losing it, save it?* How? The folly of such a supposition is very apparent. As to what is meant by saving and losing life, there can be no difference of opinion. Seeking to save life and so losing it, is a course against which we are elsewhere counseled by the Saviour. See Matt. x, 39. It is to sacrifice the principles of truth and righteousness for the purpose of avoiding loss, persecution, or perhaps, death itself in this life, and so losing eternal life. While by losing our life for the sake of Christ, that is, throwing our whole selves into his service, and standing firm though we should suffer death here, we shall have eternal life in the end. Such language, therefore, *cannot* apply to any other time than that in which character may be developed, and eternal life be gained or lost. But this period of probation ceases for quite a space of time before the Lord appears. See Rev. xxii, 11, 12: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous let him be righteous still; and he that is holy let him be holy still. And behold, I come quickly." And thus we are still more firmly held to the same conclusion, that is, that the language under consideration must apply to a space of time more or less indefinite, previous to the coming of the Son of man.

We have now shown that the terms "day" and

"night," may be used to denote a period of greater or less length, and that the context positively requires that they should be so used in Luke xvii, 30, 31, and 34. We might therefore at this point submit our proposition as proved; but there are some other considerations we wish to introduce.

The Lord then proceeds to state the different issues that will befall those who seek to save their lives from motives of selfish interest, and those who are willing to lose them for the sake of Christ: one shall be taken, and the other left.

It is important to determine what is signified by these expressions. Why, says one, this applies at the coming of the Lord, and one, the righteous, shall be taken; taken up to meet the Lord in the air, and delivered from this world and all its evils; while the other, the wicked, is left; left to be destroyed in the great conflagration. This view looks very plausible at first sight, but it is exceedingly shaken when we come to look at the definition of the words. The word, taken, has rather the sense of being taken as a captive, apprehended, seized; while the word, left, instead of signifying, left to perish, has the sense of being permitted to go away, delivered or rescued from danger. The second definition given by Liddell and Scott, to the first word, *παραλαμβάνω*, is, "To take in pledge, to take by force or treachery, seize, get possession of." The other word, *ἀφίημι*, is defined under the second head, by the same authors, as follows: "To let go, loose, set free." In accordance with these definitions, some translations read, "One shall be *seized*, and the other *escape*." The Cottage Bible comments thus: "One shall be taken, that is, as a captive." Here is a separation between the righteous and the wicked. The



one is seized, and doomed to destruction, the other escapes. And the disciples ask, "Where, Lord?" where shall this seizure and destruction take place? And he answers, "Wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together." The parallel passage in Matt. xxiv, 28, reads, "For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together." And here a word is used, which never has any other meaning but that of a corpse or lifeless body. Now those who apply all this to the literal day of the Lord's appearing, are obliged to take the body, or carcass, as a representative of Christ, and the eagles as representatives of the saints which are caught up to meet him in the air. But can this be? What! represent the Lord of glory, as he comes in majesty and triumph with all the glory of the Father, by a dead body, a loathsome carcass? and the saints who are caught up to meet him, as eagles, which go to rend and devour their prey? The idea is repulsive and revolting to the last degree.

But what may be fitly represented by the dead body? Answer, The wicked, who, as unworthy of life, are given over to destruction. And what by the eagles? Answer, The judgments of God, that come down upon them, to slay and devour them. Job, speaking of the eagle, says, "Where the slain are, there is she." Job xxxix, 30. So wherever the wicked are, the plagues of God will find them out, and come down upon them like eagles upon their prey. Describing the scenes of this time, the Psalmist says: "A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand, but it shall not come nigh thee. There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling." Ps. xci, 7, 10. Thus

the righteous escape, while the wicked by their side are seized and perish.

From this time on, we understand there is no association between the righteous and the wicked. Certainly we cannot suppose that the saints will come up to the very moment of the advent, unconcernedly carrying on their work, either in their houses or in their fields, side by side with their deadliest enemies! No; the manifest judgments of God separate the one from the other, and then we can "turn and discern between him that serveth God, and him that serveth him not." It is at this time, when Christ has ceased his intercessions, mercy pleads no more, and the plagues are falling upon the wicked, that the declaration found in Experience and Views, p. 17, will be fulfilled: "In the time of trouble, we all fled from the cities and villages, but were pursued by the wicked, who entered the houses of the saints with the sword. They raised the sword to kill us, but it broke and fell powerless as a straw," &c. This is just before the final victory of the saints, when they "cry day and night unto God for deliverance." Luke xviii, 7. This agrees perfectly with the testimony we have been considering, from Matthew and Luke.

With the view here presented, there is consistency and harmony throughout; with any other, there is not. People may endeavor to show that the testimony of Luke xvii, 26-37, refers to the very hour of the Lord's appearing, and that the righteous and wicked are up to that moment associated together in all the occupations of life, for the sake of proving the foregoing declaration from Experience and Views to be incorrect; but they can only do it by stubbornly shutting their eyes



to all the claims of the context, and ringing an insignificant round of changes on the word, "day." But it must be very apparent to all that that is but a superficial and incompetent examination of this question, which does not inquire whether the word, day, may not mean a period of indefinite duration; whether the context does not require that it be so used here; whether the expressions about being "taken" and "left," do not denote an event of such a nature that it cannot transpire at the moment of the Lord's appearing; and whether the carcass and the eagles can apply to Christ and his saints. Taking these questions into account, as we have done in the foregoing remarks, we find that the language of Luke covers a considerable period of time, and that according to his testimony, a separation between the righteous and the wicked certainly does take place before the Lord appears. Whatever discrepancy, therefore, the objector finds between this portion of scripture and the statement from Experience and Views quoted above, is only what he himself creates by his own erroneous view of the passage.

#### OBJECTION 15.—THE MAGICIANS' RODS.

She says the magicians' rods did become serpents, and that they did not really become serpents; which last declaration contradicts Ex. vii, 12, which says they did become serpents. Test. No. 7, p. 51; Gifts, Vol. iii, p. 205.

To make an objection of this, the objector has to overlook the language of appearances, which is essential to an understanding of a great portion of the Bible. Thus the Bible says the sun rises, sets, &c. Does it mean that it really rises? The

objector might here take his stand with the infidel in his foolish cavils against the Bible. If the Bible designed to be anywhere astronomically correct on these points, it would, doubtless, somewhere read, The sun does not really rise; but the revolution of the earth causes it so to appear.

But says the objector, "This contradicts Ex. vii, 12, which says they did become serpents." In answer to this, we introduce the following extract from Bush's notes on Ex. vii, 11. After stating that the magicians wrought no such miracle in reality as was performed through Moses and Aaron, he says:

"We proceed, therefore, to state the grounds of this interpretation, and in doing it we regret that, from its depending so entirely upon the idiomatic structure of the Hebrew, the mere English reader will not, perhaps, be able fully to appreciate its force. We will endeavor to make it, however, if not demonstrable, at least, intelligible. It is a canon of interpretation of frequent use in the exposition of the sacred writings that verbs of action sometimes signify merely the *will* and *endeavor* to do the action in question. Thus Eze. xxiv, 13, 'I have *purified* thee, and thou wast not purged;' *i. e.*, I have endeavored, used means, been at pains, to purify thee. John v, 44, 'How can ye believe which *receive* honor one of another;' *i. e.*, endeavor to receive. Rom. ii, 4, 'The goodness of God *leadeth* thee to repentance;' *i. e.*, endeavors, or tends, to lead thee. Amos ix, 3, 'Though they be *hid* from my sight in the bottom of the sea;' *i. e.*, though they aim to be hid. 1 Cor. x, 33, 'I *please* all men;' *i. e.*, endeavor to please. Gal. v, 4, 'Whosoever of you are *justified* by the law;' *i. e.*, seek and endeavor to be justi-



fied. Ps. lxxix, 4, 'They that *destroy* me are mighty.;' *i. e.*, that endeavor to destroy me. Eng. 'That *would* destroy me.' Acts vii, 26, 'And *set them at one* again;' *i. e.*, wished and endeavored. Eng. '*would* have set them.' The passage before us we consider as exhibiting a usage entirely analogous. 'They also did in like manner with their enchantments;' *i. e.*, they endeavored to do in like manner; just as in chap. viii, 18, it is said, 'And the magicians did so with their enchantments to bring forth lice, *but they could not*;' the words being precisely the same in both instances. Adopting this construction, we suppose that the former clause of verse 12 should be rendered, 'For they cast down every man his rod, *that they might become serpents*;' which the Hebrew reader will perceive to be a rendering precisely parallel to that which occurs in chap. vi, 11, 'Speak unto Pharaoh, *that* he let the children of Israel go;' Heb. '*And* he shall let go.' So, also, chap. vii, 2, 'Shall speak unto Pharaoh, *that* he send;' Heb. '*And* he shall send.' The magicians cast down their rods, that they might undergo a similar transmutation with that of Moses', but it is not expressly said that they *were* so changed, and we therefore incline to place their discomfiture in the loss of their rods, those instruments with which they had vainly hoped to compete with Moses. If it be contended that there was some kind of change produced on the magicians' rods, but that it was effected by feats of juggling, or legerdemain, and amounted in fact merely to an optical illusion, we do not particularly object to this construction, inasmuch as it admits our main position, that there was no *real miracle* wrought by, or through, the magicians. Perhaps, on the whole, it may be

considered as the most probable hypothesis; especially, as the narrative does not require us to understand all these various incidents as having occurred at one and the same interview."

#### OBJECTION 16.—ENTERING THE ARK.

Spiritual Gifts, Vol. iii, p. 68, says that the animals were for seven days coming into the ark, and that the family of Noah were seven days in the ark before the rain began to descend; and this is claimed as a contradiction of Gen. vii, 11-16. "In the selfsame day entered Noah, &c., into the ark. The cattle after their kind," &c. To make an objection here, the objector would carry the impression that in the very day that Noah entered into the ark, the animals came in too, and on the same day the flood came. We can only inquire if the objector has ever read the first part of Gen. vii, in which it is shown that Noah was first summoned to go into the ark, that the animals came *unto* him, into the ark, which shows that he was in there, of course, arranging them as they entered, and that *after seven days* the flood of waters came upon the earth. There is not the least contradiction between this and the vision.

#### OBJECTION 17.—ANIMALS PRESERVED.

"Every species of animals which God had created was preserved in the ark." Gifts, Vol. iii, p. 15. "There was a very large class of animals which perished at the flood." Gifts, Vol. iv, p. 121. Then, says the objector, "Either God did not create these large animals, or here is a contra-



diction." But if he had just read the very next sentence following the first quotation given above, his contradiction would have at once vanished: "The confused species which God did not create, which were the result of amalgamation, were destroyed by the flood." Vol. iii, p. 15.

OBJECTION 18.—THE CLOSE OF THE 1000 YEARS.

"At the close of the thousand years, Jesus and the angels and all the saints with him leave the holy city, and while he is descending to the earth with them, the wicked dead are raised." Ex. & Views, p. 34. As a contradiction to this, a quotation is made from Gifts, Vol. i, as follows: "At the end of the one thousand years, Jesus left the city, and a train of the angelic host followed him. Jesus descended upon a great and mighty mountain, which, as soon as his feet touched it, parted asunder and became a mighty plain. Then we looked up and saw the great and beautiful city. \* \* \* And it came down in all its splendor and dazzling glory, and settled in the plain. \* \* \* Then Jesus, and all the holy retinue of angels, and all the redeemed saints, left the city. \* \* \* Then Jesus in terrible, fearful majesty called forth the wicked dead. Gifts, Vol. i, p. 213. The objector then asks the question, "When did Jesus raise them? While he was descending as first stated, or after the city come [!] down as last stated?"

It will be difficult for the reader to understand the dishonest work that has been made in garbling and perverting this testimony, unless he has the books and can refer to them himself. From the manner in which the quotation is given, he would think it was all one connected paragraph, on the

same page, and referring to the same subject, instead of a part of it being on *another page*, and *under a new chapter*, and *on a new subject*, as is actually the case! In one instance in the quotation, as the objector gives it, there is nearly a line omitted, with nothing at all to indicate it. Next, three and a half lines are omitted, signified by the insertion of three stars. But where the leaf turns, and a new chapter and new subject are introduced, the change is indicated by only two stars! The commencement and close of the quotation is simply the rehearsal of the same facts applied to two different subjects. The subject of chap. xxxix, of Gifts, Vol. i, is "The Earth Desolated;" and in that chapter we are taken down through the period of its desolation to the time when the city is located upon it. The point in the quotation where this chapter ends is this: "And it came down in all its splendor and dazzling glory, and settled in the [mighty] plain [which Jesus had prepared for it.] Then opens chapter xi, and the subject of that chapter is "The Second Resurrection;" and in the opening of that chapter we are carried right back to the holy city, and to the exit of Christ and his people therefrom before it comes down. The reader would at once have seen this, if the objector had not dishonestly concealed the fact that a new chapter was opened, and then suppressed two lines and a half of the testimony, for which no reason is given. Chapter xl opens thus: "Then Jesus, and all the holy retinue of angels, and all the redeemed saints, left the city. The holy angels surrounded Jesus and escorted him on his way, and the train of redeemed saints followed. Then Jesus, in terrible,



fearful majesty, called forth the wicked dead, &c. "The angels escorted him on his way." On his way where? we ask, if the city and the heavenly company had already descended. It is on the authority of such garbled quotations as this, that we are asked to discard the visions. We beg to be excused.

Perhaps some may refer to Vol. iii, pp. 83, 84, where the same facts are stated, undivided by a chapter; but the same principle will hold good here as in the former case. It is a principle common to all writings, not only the Bible, but to every book in which there are different series of events narrated which synchronize in the time of their fulfillment. We are carried down through one series, and when that is completed, we are taken back to the commencement of another.

It is a characteristic of infidelity, that it will not allow us to apply to the Bible the same rules of interpretation that we do to other books; and it is a characteristic of these objections to the visions, that they will not allow us to understand the visions as we do the Bible.

#### OBJECTION 19.—MEN BEFORE THE FLOOD.

Gifts, Vol. iii, p. 84, states that those who lived before the flood were more than twice as tall as men now living; that the generations after the flood were less in stature; and that there has been a continual decrease to the present time; and this, it is claimed, contradicts—what? Some other vision? No; the Bible? No; but "facts." What facts? Oh, a writer in the American Tract Society's Bible Dictionary, conjectures from mummies and some other things that the race of mankind

never exceeded, in the average, their present stature! O weakness! where are thy swaddling bands! Somebody conjectures that the human race never could have been larger than at present; therefore the vision must be false! But it is a notorious fact, that evidence has come forth upon this point, amply sufficient to sustain the testimony of the vision. Much of it has appeared in late volumes of the REVIEW; and it is now almost daily coming up fresh from the bosom of the earth—evidence from the discovery of organic remains, sufficient to show beyond a sane doubt, that at some period in the past there existed on this earth a class of gigantic men and animals, in comparison with which the present species are but pigmies. Before such facts as these, the objection vanishes like chaff before the whirlwind.

#### OBJECTION 20.—THE TEMPLE IN THE CITY.

"I saw an angel flying swiftly to me. He carried me from the earth to the holy city. In the city I saw a temple, which I entered." Ex. & Views, p. 16. This, says the objector, contradicts Rev. xxi, 22: "And I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God and the Lamb are the temple of it."

To this objection we reply: Sister White saw the city as it exists at the present time; John, in Rev. xxi, 22, saw it after it had come down to the earth at the end of the 1000 years. The two views are over a thousand years apart, and in different dispensations; that is all the difference! Now it does seem that persons of common capacity ought to be able to come within a thousand years of the time of which they write. If they do not



do this, is there not with them a serious deficiency either in head or heart? But John, in another part of his vision, viewing things in the city in this dispensation, the same time of which sister White writes, says that he did see a temple therein: "And the temple of God was opened in Heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament," &c. Rev. xi, 19. Now why did not the objector turn his infidel weapons against the Bible and say that here is a contradiction between Rev. xi, 19, and Rev. xxi, 22, because in one place John says there was a temple there, and in the other that there was not? The temple of God, as it now exists in Heaven, is the sanctuary; and sister W. so describes it. So also says the Revelation; for in it was seen the ark of his testament. And to deny that there is now a temple in Heaven, as the objector would have us do, is to deny the plain Bible truth that there is now a sanctuary in Heaven; and all this for the sake of getting something against the visions. We have only to say that we do not feel disposed to deny the Bible, for the sake of denying the visions. The reason why there is no temple in the city after it has come down to earth, is evidently because, the plan of salvation being finished, there is no longer occasion for the sanctuary work. What disposition is made of this temple, the Bible does not inform us. Possibly it is removed from the city, and becomes the temple described in Experience and Views, p. 14, as existing outside of the city; or it may be put to such a different use as to cease to be the temple of God.

But the objector replies to this that there is room enough in Heaven for a temple outside of the city, and John does not say it was in the city;

so there is no contradiction in his testimony. We answer that John's language does prove that the temple now in Heaven is in the city. 1. It is called the temple of God. This it could not be unless it was his dwelling place. 2. It is the sanctuary, into the first apartment of which John had a view in Rev. iv; and there he saw the throne of God, and him that sat thereon. See works on the Sanctuary. 3. Christ was caught up to God and his throne, and is now on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the Heavens, a minister of the sanctuary. Rev. xii, 5; iii, 21; Heb. viii, 1, 2, and other scriptures. 4. At the conclusion of the seven last plagues, a great voice comes out of the temple of Heaven from the throne, saying, It is done. Rev. xvi, 17. These testimonies conclusively prove that the throne of God is in the temple in Heaven, and that there God and Christ have their dwelling place. Now who can believe that God and Christ reside outside of the city? But if they do not, then the temple is in the city; for they dwell therein. But what about this city? (1.) It is the bride, the Lamb's wife. Rev. xxi, 9, 10. (2.) Its maker is its husband. Isa. liv, 1, 5; Gal. iv, 26, 27. (3.) Christ expressly calls it, "the city of my God." Rev. iii, 12; and in John xiv, 2, he calls it his Father's house of many mansions, and left his followers a promise that they should be taken there to be with him. Now talk about this city's not being the residence of God! It is the height of absurdity. But the objector thought to get out of a close place by saying, There is room enough in Heaven for a temple, outside of the city. Such a subterfuge is too transparent to shield him from merited contempt.



## OBJECTION 21.—THE FATHER'S PERSON.

"The Father's person I could not behold, for a cloud of glorious light covered him. I asked Jesus if his Father had a form like himself. He said he had, but I could not behold it; for, said he, if you should once behold the glory of his person, you would cease to exist." A few words further on, the objector fancies he finds a contradiction as follows: "And I saw the Father rise from the throne and in a flaming chariot go into the Holy of Holies, and did sit. Ex. & Views, p. 43.

How any person could bring forward as a contradiction, testimony which so evidently explains itself, we are unable to perceive. It illustrates the statement made in the commencement of this work, that the objector, in order to make his objections appear respectable as to numbers, will seize upon the least point where he thinks he can palm off upon the inattentive reader his misrepresentations. If a cloud of glorious light enveloped the Father, and she knew that it was the Father who was thus veiled from her sight in his unapproachable glory, when that cloud passed into the holy of holies, would she not know that it was the Father who moved? Could she not properly say that she saw the Father rise up from the throne and go into the most holy place? Who would think of questioning this but he who was under a desperate pressure to make out his case?

But the objector may say further, the Bible declares that no man hath seen God, and no one can see him and live. John i, 18; Ex. xxxiii, 20. Very true; but yet the prophet Daniel saw the Ancient of days, and has given us a description of his hair and his garments, and the appearance of

his throne. Dan. vii, 9, 10. But there is no contradiction here; for seeing God in vision is not seeing him in our natural condition and with our natural eyes. It may be proper to add that the Lord is represented as clothed with majesty and light as with a garment. Ps. civ, 1, 2. This cloud of light, then, if we may so speak, was his clothing. A person may be clothed so as to conceal the form, but we have no difficulty, nevertheless, in telling when he moves. It is with just such cavils as this that infidelity attacks the Bible.

## OBJECTION 22.—BATTLE OF MANASSES.

Her vision of the Battle of Manasses is contradictory, says the objector. How? It is represented that Southern men felt the battle, and would in a little have been driven further back; but that the North, if they had pushed on, would eventually have found themselves in the midst of a greater struggle, and greater destruction. And this could all have been so. There is no contradiction about it.

## OBJECTION 23.—TREE OF LIFE.

"Her view of the tree of life is much more fanciful than true." Indeed! Our fancy is to judge is it of the truthfulness of these things! Why does not the objector say the same thing of Ezekiel's vision of the living creatures, and living wheels; Zechariah's vision of the stone with seven eyes, and the flying roll; John's view of the four beasts, a city of gold transparent like glass! &c., &c. He asks if the idea of a gold tree is altogether reasonable. Why don't he ask if it is altogether



reasonable to talk about gold's being transparent like glass, as John does? Who ever saw any transparent gold? In regard to there being but one tree, with a trunk on each side of the river, we have a most striking illustration of how this can be, in the banyan tree of India, the branches of which take root and become new trunks sending out other branches, till the tree comes to be supported by hundreds of trunks, covering, perhaps, acres of ground, yet all the trunks being connected together in the wide-spreading top, and forming but one tree. See Webster's Dictionary, and Am. Encyclopedia.

#### OBJECTION 24.—SUPPRESSED.

"Many things in her older visions are now suppressed, no doubt on account of their appearance of fanaticism and wild imagination." Yes, "*no doubt!*" Concerning the charge of suppression we shall speak in due time. We just wish the reader to note here that these are urged as strong points against the visions, and to mark how they resolve themselves into the single and solitary "*no doubt*" of the objector—very weighty, unquestionably, in his own mind.

#### OBJECTION 25.—SPEAKING AGAINST VISIONS.

"She has taught," it is further urged, "in a suppressed vision, that to speak against her visions is to sin against the Holy Ghost." This statement is a misrepresentation; for it is only a particular company of persons, under particular circumstances, that are referred to.

#### OBJECTION 26.—IGNORING PRIVATE JUDGMENT.

What the objector says about their ignoring the right of private judgment, correcting the erring, and uniting the people of God, is all met by Eph. iv, 1-13, unless he can show from other indubitable evidence that the visions are not among the means there specified as set in the church to bring us to the unity of the faith.

#### OBJECTION 27.—NOT SPEAKING SMOOTH THINGS.

But what will not the opposer seize upon as an objection to the visions? It is usually considered a characteristic of false prophets that they prophesy peace, and speak smooth things; and the Bible so represents. But lo! the visions are denounced as false because they do not do this very thing. They denounce sin, they expose evil, they warn the church of its dangers, point out its wrongs and reveal its failings. Then, says the objector, this people are not God's people, or they would not be guilty of being in such a condition as to merit these reproofs; but the visions say they are God's people; hence the visions are false. According to this objection no people can be God's people who are guilty of any wrong whatever; or if they are, they must never be reproofed for it; and moreover, they can never get right and regain God's favor, and be saved at last; for God's people must always be perfect; and if they are ever in a condition to merit reproof, they are not his people! A more stultified and unscriptural process of reasoning, than is involved in this objection, is rarely to be met with. It does away with the Bible, and with every Christian people who have ever lived. It is requiring altogether too much to ask us to give up the visions for such reasons as this.



## OBJECTION 28.—MATTERS IN IOWA.

The nature of objections to the visions depends considerably upon the locality from which they come. Wherever wrongs have been exposed or errors reproved, when opposition breaks out, these things are sure to come up in the fore front among the objections. There were, unfortunately, some fanatical movements in Iowa relative to the late war; and it so happens that those who are now (1866) leading off in that section in opposition to the visions, are the ones who were principally concerned in those movements. They were reproved by vision; and it is perhaps not to be wondered at, that, still smarting under the ignominious failure of their fanatical schemes, they should feel sensitive on this point. We have never known a person who had once committed himself upon the visions, to rise up in opposition to them, till his own dear self was in some way, either directly or indirectly, touched by their testimony. And here we discover, perhaps the principal, at least a not very remote, cause of the present opposition to the visions in that State. It would no doubt be a great gratification to those concerned to be able to prove that others in other places had been equally fanatical, and were not reproved, and so that the visions were at least inconsistent, or partial in their testimony. This they attempt with a good deal of spirit; but facts are woefully against them. The circumstances may be summed up in brief as these: In Iowa, under the pressure of repeated calls for men by the government, certain ones appealed to the legislature of that State to enact a law exempting Seventh-day Adventists from military duty. As any one might have foreseen, they utterly failed in their object; and what kind of notoriety did they gain by the transaction. Any one who wished to avoid military duty was at that time looked upon with

suspicion; but here was a class who not only wished to avoid military duty, but asked that special laws might be promulgated in their behalf, in order that they might do it. If the authorities could bring special pressure to bear upon any class, it would be sure to be such.

On the other hand, the General Conference Committee, to whom the brethren were all looking to do something in their behalf, sent up a petition to the government, and carried it to headquarters where all such petitions belong,—for what? For a law to be *enacted* especially in their favor? No; but for the benefit of a law *already existing*. The law exempting non-combatants was already in force; and if we could show ourselves to be such as were contemplated in its provision, the law was bound to protect us. This the committee undertook to do, and succeeded in doing. The one was a reasonable project, prosecuted in a proper manner, and in the end successful. The other was a spasmodic irrational effort, prosecuted in a spirit of fanaticism, so one of its principal abettors has once confessed, and in the end an utter failure. This is the difference between the two efforts. Yet now these disappointed Iowa aspirants for military favor, have the effrontery to come forth and declare that if their movement was fanaticism, the action of the committee was “*fanaticism intensified!*” We leave the reader to judge upon which side the intensity belongs.

But this is not the worst feature of their treatment of the course of the committee in this matter. The action of the committee involved an expense in procuring testimony, employing counsel, making journeys, &c., &c., in comparison with which the cost of the paper and printing of the documents which they issued, was scarcely to be taken into account; yet these murmurers set forth that the price of these documents was exorbitant, because a



few pages out of the sixteen were blank, as though the mere printing was the main thing! And when subsequent steps were taken, involving a still greater expense, and the necessary documents were then issued to enable our brethren to avail themselves of the exemption act, they complain again that an extra fifty cents was added to the price of these documents when sent out of the State of Michigan. Now it was fully explained in the paper, at the time these documents were published, see *REVIEW*, Volume xxv, No. 16, that those which were to be used out of the State, must be taken to the county clerk, thirteen miles, to receive his certificate, a step that did not have to be taken with those used within the State; and if any think fifty cents each was an exorbitant price to cover the time and expense of the journey, the cost of the certificate, and the requisite stamp, the worst wish we have for them is, that they were obliged to foot the bill out of the proceeds. But they carefully keep back all these facts, and endeavor to appeal to the prejudice of the reader, by representing that advantage was taken of those living out of the State.

And then, plunging into a still greater depth of turpitude, they add: "Since nobody is in danger of being drafted, these books can be had for one dollar. Somobody's necessities must have been taken advantage of." The occasion of the books being offered for one dollar after the close of the war is explained by the following resolution, which was passed, be it remembered, at the session of the General Conference of 1865.

*Whereas*, The General Conference Committee have been under the necessity of incurring a considerable expense in preparing and procuring preliminary proofs and documents, to enable certain of our brethren to avail themselves of the law in favor of non-combatants, which expense as yet has been but partially met from the avails of said proofs and documents, therefore,

*Resolved*, That this Conference hereby request all those for

whose personal benefit said expense was incurred, viz., those who were liable to the draft—and all others who are so disposed, to contribute one dollar each for the purpose of defraying the same, and that each of said contributors be entitled to a copy of said documents.

This action speaks for itself. It was deliberately done in open session of the highest body known among Seventh-day Adventists; and moreover, those very persons who now throw out their base insinuations against it, were present and voted for it! Why did they not withhold their votes, and exhibit their opposition there before the Conference? But after having by their votes acknowledged that the expense of the work had not been met, and that it should be made up in the way the resolution indicated, how can they now turn about as they do and denounce the course of the committee? Such hypocrisy is too transparent to need exposure.

They further complain that during the war nothing was shown about the duty of the brethren in view of the draft, but a vision was given showing the length at which women should wear their dresses. In this they have stated an absolute falsehood; for what was published about dress was only an article from sister White in *How to Live*, No. 6, page 63. It does not purport to be a vision. That is a clause of their own adding. Now could not sister White write an article during the rebellion on any other subject but war, without being denounced therefor? Misrepresentations like this may for awhile have some influence; but they must surely in the end rebound disastrously upon the heads of their authors.

#### OBJECTION 29.—PEDDLING BIBLE CONTRADICTIONS.

The objector declares further, that S. D. A. ministers gather up from infidels contradictions in the Bible, and peddle them around to sustain the con-



traditions in the visions. This is another malicious falsehood. No S. D. A. minister acknowledges that there are any real contradictions in the Bible; and they know it. What our ministers do do, is this: They hold up the infidel's objections against the Bible, side by side with the anti-visionist's objections against the visions; and they show that they are all from the same piece. The same principles and the same arguments that the infidel makes use of to establish contradictions in the Bible, these use to establish contradictions in the visions. This the reader can see in the objections we have already answered in this work. They are mere misrepresentations and cavils. And if the reasoning of one class is valid, so is the other. But we deny them both. We deny that there are any real contradictions in the Bible or in the visions either.

#### OBJECTION 30.—HUMAN FORESIGHT.

What is said about the visions containing nothing that is beyond human foresight, and human wisdom, and nothing but that with which the person to whom they are given is already acquainted, finds a sufficient reply in the visions themselves. They abound in points which show this objection to be false, as any reader may satisfy himself by a few moment's perusal of their testimony.

#### OBJECTION 31.—THE SEALING TIME.

The visions show that the sealing time commenced in 1844; and yet it is claimed that the REVIEW teaches that we are just entering into that time. Although this is offered as an objection to the visions, the most that can be claimed for it, certainly, is that here is a discrepancy between the teachings of the REVIEW and the visions; but this

would by no means prove the visions false. But there is no discrepancy between the two. The trouble with the objector all arises from his overlooking the very plain fact that the sealing time covers a period during which a progressive work is carried on upon the earth. The third angel's message is a sealing message; but a person is not sealed as soon as he embraces it. Time is given for the development of a holy character, by obedience to the truth. And the message is designed to bring people to a position where they can be sealed absolutely, in the sense of having their cases forever decided for Heaven. Yet all the time covered by this message is the sealing time. In the sense of decision of character, the closing work in the sanctuary in Heaven is also a sealing work. This work, the cleansing of the sanctuary, commenced in 1844, and the time during which it is carried on is the sealing time. It is a time when investigative judgment sits upon all characters, and every individual of the human race has his place assigned him [not his punishment or reward meted out] either among the righteous or the wicked. Now it must be apparent to all that by far a greater proportion of this time must be occupied with the cases of the dead, than with the cases of the living. And while the decisions of the sanctuary are going on in relation to the dead, a message goes forth to the living to prepare a people for the time when the decisions of the sanctuary shall have respect to them. That message is now going forth; and what the REVIEW has taught is that the time is about to commence when the cases of the living will come up in the investigative judgment in the sanctuary above, and those who are found righteous among them will be sealed for Heaven. The work brought to view in Rev. vii, 1-3, has reference of course to the living, not to the dead. By overlooking this plain distinction, the objector fancies he finds a dis-



crepancy between the REVIEW and the visions, and hopes to make capital out of it against the visions. But if there was any disagreement between them, it would only prove the REVIEW at fault, and make nothing whatever for his cause; and since there is none at all, he is left to get what consolation he can from the fact that his own lack of discrimination is the only ground of all his fancied triumph here.

OBJECTION 32.—TIME TO COMMENCE THE SABBATH.

Here the objector finds another contradiction in the visions, by asserting that they once taught that the Sabbath should commence at six o'clock P. M.; and that the time was subsequently changed by vision to sunset. This we meet with an unqualified denial. The visions never taught that the Sabbath should commence at six o'clock; and the article setting forth the reasons for sunset time, published in the REVIEW, Vol vii, No. 10, antedates the vision which the objector claims was given to change the time. The following statement from one who has been connected with this cause from the very commencement, and who is therefore qualified to speak, sets forth the truth on this point. We give it for the benefit of those who may be interested to know the facts in the case, copying from REVIEW, Vol. xxxi, No. 11:

"It is generally known to most of the readers of the REVIEW, that for several years in the early history of Seventh-day Adventists, believers adopted six o'clock P. M. as the time for the Sabbath to commence and close. It is also known that in the autumn of 1855, the REVIEW taught that sunset was the Bible time to commence the Sabbath, and that our people generally changed from six o'clock to sunset. Some of the circumstances connected with this change I wish here to state:

"1. The six o'clock time was called in question

by a portion of believers as early as 1847, some maintaining that the Sabbath commenced at sunrise, while others claimed Bible evidence in favor of sunset.

"2. Elder J. B., who was the first to teach the Sabbath in its importance, and faithfully labor to bring out a people from among the Adventists to observe it, was very decided upon the six o'clock time. His decided stand upon the question, and respect for his years, and his godly life, might have been among the reasons why this point was not sooner investigated as thoroughly as some other points.

"3. In the autumn of 1855, Elder J. N. A. called on me at Battle Creek, on his way to Iowa, and set before me the scriptural reasons for commencing the Sabbath at sunset. He had written a clear article upon the subject, which he left with me, and which appeared in the REVIEW for December 4, 1855. This article, however, before it appeared in the REVIEW was read at the Conference at Battle Creek about that time, and the subject was discussed, resulting in settling the minds of the brethren on the sunset-time, with the exception of Bro. B. and a few others. Since that time there has been general agreement among us upon the subject.

"But there are persons who seek to injure us as a people—and this class we hope to help by this article—who report and publish to the world that Mrs. White did profess to be shown that the time to commence the Sabbath was six o'clock, and that at a later period she was shown that sunset was the true time. It is also stated that in vision she saw the dial-plate of a clock with one hand pointing to vi, the other to xii, showing that six o'clock was the commencement and close of the Sabbath.

"A simple statement of the facts in the case are sufficient, to show these reports false. Hence we



give the following statements, which we are ready to prove by most competent witnesses:

"1. Mrs. White has in two visions been shown something in regard to the time of the commencement of the Sabbath. The first was as early as 1847, at Topsham, Me. In that vision she was shown that to commence the Sabbath at sunrise was wrong. She then heard an angel repeat these words, "From even unto even shall ye celebrate your Sabbaths." Bro. B. was present and succeeded in satisfying all present that "even" was six o'clock. Mark this: The vision at Topsham did not teach the six o'clock time. It only corrected sunrise time. I never received the idea that the six o'clock time was sustained by the visions, hence the following which I copy from a statement I made in the *REVIEW* upon this subject, December 4, 1855, as follows:

"We have never been fully satisfied with the testimony presented in favor of six o'clock, while the various communications received for a few years past advocating both sunrise and sunset time, have been almost destitute of argument, and the spirit of humility and candor. The subject has troubled us, yet we have never found time to thoroughly investigate it.

"In June, 1854, we urged Elder D. P. H. to prepare an article on the subject for the *REVIEW*. When with him in Pennsylvania, last winter, we repeated the request. When in Maine, last summer, we stated our feelings on this subject to Bro. A., and our fears of division unless the question could be settled by good testimony. He decided to devote his time to the subject till he ascertained what the Bible taught in regard to it, and his article in this number is the result of his investigation. Some have the impression that six o'clock time has been taught among us by the direct manifestation of the Holy Spirit. This is a mistake;

'From even unto even' was the teaching from which six o'clock time has been inferred."

"2. In regard to the clock-face, twenty competent witnesses are ready to testify that neither Mrs. W. nor her visions had anything to do with it whatever."

3. We were present at the Conference referred to above, and also when the vision was given after the close of that Conference, and heard Sr. W. soon after coming out of vision, relate what she had seen. We are therefore prepared to testify that sunset time was not once mentioned in the vision; but the words given to her in the previous vision were repeated, namely, "From even to even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath;" and these words were now added: "Take the word of God, read it, understand, and ye cannot err. Read carefully, and ye shall there find *what* even is and *when* it is." In the first vision we were directed to the word of God by the words "From even to even;" but on astronomical grounds, it was then decided that even was six o'clock. In the second, exactly the same words were used, and we were more especially directed to the word of God, which when examined conclusively establishes sunset time. This settled the matter with Bro. B. and a few others, and general harmony has since prevailed on the question.

"But the question naturally arises, If the visions are given to correct the erring, why did she not sooner see the error of the six o'clock time? It does not appear to be the design of the Lord to teach his people by the gifts of the Spirit on Bible questions until his servants have diligently searched his word. When this was done upon the subject of time to commence the Sabbath, and most were established, and some were in danger of being out of harmony with the body on this subject, then, yes, *then*, was the very time for God to magnify his goodness in the manifestation of the gift of his



Spirit in the accomplishment of its proper work. The sacred Scriptures are given us as the rule of faith and duty, and we are commanded to search them. If we fail to understand and fully obey the truths in consequence of not searching the Scriptures as we should, or a want of consecration and spiritual discernment, and God in mercy in his own time corrects us by some manifestation of the gifts of his Holy Spirit, instead of murmuring that he did not do it before, let us humbly acknowledge his mercy, and praise him for his infinite goodness in condescending to correct us at all. Let the gifts have their proper place in the church. God has never set them in the very front, and commanded us to look to them to lead us in the path of truth, and the way to Heaven. His word he has magnified. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are man's lamp to light up his path to the kingdom. Follow that. But if you err from Bible truth, and are in danger of being lost, it may be that God will in the time of his choice correct you, and bring you back to the Bible and save you. And would it become you in such a case to murmur and say, 'Lord, why didst thou not do this before?' Take care! 'Be still, and know that I am God.' Our necessity is his opportunity to teach us by the gifts of his Holy Spirit."

We stated that the article setting forth the reasons for sunset time, which is the one referred to in the foregoing extract from the REVIEW, antedates the vision which the objector claims was given to change the time. To this the objector replies: "When was the vision given to change the time for commencing the Sabbath? Answer, November 20, 1855. Test. No. 1, page 7. When was the 'article setting forth the reasons for sunset time' published? Answer, December 4, 1855. U. Smith says 'the article antedates the vision;' but we find that the article was not published till about two

weeks after the vision was given." Let a few facts answer: It was in the autumn of 1855 that the Office was moved from Rochester, N. Y., to Battle Creek, Mich. The last paper published in Rochester was dated October 30, 1855. The first one published in Battle Creek was dated December 4, 1855. It was during this interval that the question of sunset time was discussed and decided by S. D. Adventists as a body. The writer of the above-mentioned article commenced his work upon it in August preceding. His concluding note, as may be seen in REVIEW of December 4, 1855, was dated Battle Creek, November 12, 1855. The Conference was held November 16, 1855. At this Conference the article was discussed and endorsed, with a few exceptions, as setting forth the correct view. After the Conference, November 20, the vision was given, establishing those undecided, on the sunset time. The next paper published was December 4, 1855; hence the article could not appear before that time. The trouble with the objector here is, that he can see no difference between the date when an article is written, and the date when it is published; or else he endeavors willfully to deceive and mislead the reader.

#### OBJECTION 33.—THE HOLDING OF THE WINDS.

It was shown in vision some sixteen years since that the winds were being held, and that they would be held till Jesus' work in the most holy place was finished. Then, says the objector, his work there must be now finished, according to the vision; for the winds began to blow in the recent terrible rebellion in the United States. But cannot the objector see that an outbreak of the winds, and their being restrained, is not the blowing of the winds? And how would it be known that they were being held, unless there should be an occasional outbreak,



and that outbreak be by some unseen power suddenly restrained? But all such outbreaks will be checked till the work of Christ is finished in the sanctuary. Then the nations will be permitted to plunge into that final conflict for which the spirits of devils and their own anger, are now preparing them. There is no difficulty here.

#### OBJECTION 34.—THE THOUSAND YEARS' JUDGMENT.

"Sr. White has seen," says the objector, "that every case is decided before Jesus leaves the sanctuary; and again she sees that during the thousand years the saints sit in judgment with Christ, which is a positive contradiction." This objection must have been put in just to swell the list. It would almost be an imposition on the good sense of the reader to enter into a formal explanation of it. It need only be remarked that the decision that takes place before Christ leaves the sanctuary, is simply a decision as to who are righteous and who are wicked; while the work that the saints perform in conjunction with Christ during the thousand years, is not to decide who are wicked, but only to mete out to those already decided to be such, the full measure of their punishment. This is most fully and minutely explained in the visions themselves.

#### OBJECTION 35.—MURMURERS.

Another exhibition of an astonishing lack of perception is given us in the following: In Testimony No. 10, certain persons are pointed out as complainers and murmurers, for continually expressing their fears that the body of Sabbath-keepers are becoming like the world, &c., whereas in other testimonies, the visions themselves reprove the body of Sabbath-keepers for becoming like the world. Here, says the objector, is an inconsistency at least; for

if the visions are correct in saying that Sabbath-keepers are like the world, the others cannot be wrong who say the same thing.

We have only to reply that they do not say the same thing. By examining the testimony a person cannot fail to see that those whom the visions reprove, are such as strike against every advance step on the part of this people, such as church order, organization, building meeting-houses, &c., and base their opposition on the plea that in *these things* Sabbath-keepers are becoming just like the world, backsliding, &c., &c. But the visions speak of different things entirely. Their reproof is for those who in *pride, vanity, dress, manners, and conversation* are conforming to the world. The two are as distinct as could well be conceived. And we can account for such an objection as this, only on the ground that those who offer it, have suffered the god of this world to envelop their minds in a pitiable blindness.

#### OBJECTION 36.—MEATS FOR FOOD.

On this point the objector claims that the testimony of the visions is contradictory and opposed to the Bible. We shall not follow him in all his tortuous wanderings here. His work is but a tissue of confusion. He gives that as a vision which is not, and does not purport to be such. His quotations are garbled, a sentence being detached from one page and applied to another subject on another page. And events that took place hundreds of miles, and many years, apart, are confounded together. All this is done to prove to the reader that the visions have taught that swine's flesh is good and nourishing food. But they have never so taught. The chief point, however, over which there seems to be a disposition to cavil, is a statement on page 121, of *Spiritual Gifts*, Vol. iv: "And he



[God] permitted that long-lived race to eat animal food to shorten their sinful lives." This is spoken of the generations that lived immediately after the flood. A few lines that immediately precede it, read as follows: "After the flood the people ate largely of animal food. God saw that the ways of man were corrupt, and that he was disposed to exalt himself proudly against his Creator, and to follow the inclinations of his own heart. And he permitted that long-lived race to eat animal food to shorten their sinful lives." If this is so, says the objector, why did God also permit Noah and the Israelites, his chosen people, to eat of it, when the effect upon them would be the same? We answer, We have no idea that God ever did give permission to any one to partake of it in the manner that it was partaken of by the wicked soon after the flood. Mark the expression, "After the flood the people ate *largely* of animal food." In that word "*largely*" lies, as we understand it, their chief sin. Just as eating and drinking are mentioned as sins of the last days; not that eating and drinking in themselves considered are sinful; but the sin is in the *excess* committed in these things, and in the devotion of the people to them. And when God saw that that long-lived race were determined to give themselves up to every excess of lust and riot, he permitted them to go on eating largely of animal food, stimulating their passions, and rapidly exhausting their vital energies. And the Bible teaches essentially the same thing, in relation to the incorrigibly wicked, whom God gives up to their own lusts, to be filled with their own doings. See the following testimonies:

"But my people would not hearken to my voice; and Israel would none of me. So I *gave them up* unto their own hearts' lust; and they walked in their own counsels." Ps. lxxxii, 11, 12.

"Then God turned, and *gave them up* to worship

the host of heaven; as it is written in the book of the prophets, O ye house of Israel, have ye offered to me slain beasts and sacrifices by the space of forty years in the wilderness?" Acts vii, 42.

"Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves." Rom. i, 24.

"And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. ii, 11, 12.

In view of such testimonies as these, why should it be thought a strange thing that God should suffer the postdiluvians who became hopeless apostates from him, to shorten their sinful lives by an excess of their own lusts?

But the objector urges further, that Abraham, when the angels came to him, ran to the herd, and killed a calf, good and tender, and set before them, and they did eat. Why was this, if meat is such bad food? This circumstance is introduced, we suppose, to show that Abraham made use of meat; for the question before us is not what angels may eat, but what is best for man. But even here a bare thought of that commonest of all adages, "Circumstances alter cases," would have saved any question. A well man can eat with comparative impunity what would be ruinous to a sick one. Give us the strong physical powers of Abraham, and as healthy meat as he had, and we will use it as freely as he did, if the objector will give us the requisite information as to how freely that was. (?) But in comparison with Abraham we are a puny and sickly race, and in comparison with the animals of his day, the animals of the present day are greatly degenerated, and prone to disease. Now because strong persons, nearly four thousand years



ago, could eat temperately of the flesh of healthy animals without apparent injury, it is no reason why an enfeebled generation, like the present, can partake without injury of the flesh of the degenerate and sickly animals of these last days. There have been, no doubt, healthy hogs (as healthy as those animals can be), but we do not care, on that account, to run the risk of partaking of the diseased swine of to-day, and squirming into the grave with a multitude of the horrid trichina in our muscles. The meat question is all right.

OBJECTION 37.—SISTER WHITE'S PAY.

But, say the objectors, The pay that sister White gets shows that she is not a true prophetess. They then refer to some of the ancient prophets, and the privations and persecutions which they endured, and assert that if the visions of Sr. W. were genuine, she would receive the same treatment. They think it a horrible thing that her works gain her a support. They have grown wiser than Paul, who thought the laborer was worthy of his hire. They would doubtless be glad to see her reduced to penury, persecuted, imprisoned, stoned, and driven for shelter to the dens and caves of the earth. If this is not their idea, then there is no point to their objection. All we have to say is, that there is feeling enough against her to do all this; and the only reason it is not done is undoubtedly because people, the objectors with the rest, have not power to carry out the bitterness and malignity of their spirits toward her. In touching the question of her pay, they have struck the wrong vein; for their own course toward her is an utter refutation of their charge.

One individual, however, has the amusing presumption to appeal to figures to sustain this charge. He gives a list of the works prepared by sister

White, and the amount they would bring at the retail price, amounting to \$11,435.00. All this, he says, "in less than ten years! averaging \$1,143.50 a year! And then he adds, "Is it not a paying business? Which of God's ancient prophets got rich? Surely no one." Here follows a quotation from Hebrews, "They wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins," &c., after which he continues: "Look at the contrast! This prophetess of the nineteenth century has a salary of more than eleven hundred dollars a year!" Before we look at the contrast, let us look a moment at this statement. 1. It proceeds upon the ground that none of Sr. White's works are given away. But those who know anything about it, know that many are disposed of in this manner. 2. It considers the entire edition of every work sold and paid for; whereas all know that a large edition of any work is a long time finding its way to the market; and the great bulk of some of these works are even yet on hand. 3. It not only supposes them all sold, but all sold at full retail price; whereas all know that the larger portion of publications go off at wholesale, that is, at one-quarter or one-third, discount. 4. But most idiotic of all, it proceeds upon the assumption that the paper, typesetting, printing, binding, and mailing, of all these works, never cost a cent!! The entire proceeds are reckoned up as clear profits, and called "her salary!" A man of any sensibility whatever, would forever hide his head for shame, after having made an attack exhibiting an intellect so obtuse, or a disposition so contemptible.



## OBJECTION 38.—THE NUMBER OF THE BEAST.

She saw in 1847, says the objector, that the number 666 of the image beast was made up. This is based on language found in Word to the Little Flock, p. 19, as follows: "I saw all that 'would not receive the mark of the Beast, and of his image, in their foreheads or in their hands,' could not buy or sell. (o) I saw that the number (666) of the Image Beast was made up; (p) and that it was the Beast that changed the Sabbath," &c. Now says the objector from the West, she here teaches that the number is the number of the image beast, but the REVIEW now teaches that the number belongs to the "first" or papal beast; and besides, the image beast has no number; and therefore the vision is notoriously false and out of joint. And hereupon a little "Voice" pipes up in the East to re-echo the sentiment, as it thinks such facts, "though painful [?] to learn," "should be more generally known;" and lo, like their prototypes of old, they make merry and send gifts one to another. Rev. xi, 10. It is, perhaps, almost too bad to upset this little cup of froth over which they gloat with such apparent delight; but facts will most effectually do it. Those who have the Word to the Little Flock, and can read it for themselves, will notice, from what is stated on p. 21, that this vision was not published by sister White, nor by Bro. White, but by still another person. They will notice also that all through the vision, letters are inserted inclosed in parentheses, like the letters "(o)" and "(p)" in the extract above given. These refer to scriptures placed at the bottom of the page, and were the work of the publisher, not of sister W. They will

then notice that the figures 666, in the sentence, "I saw that the number (666) of the Image Beast was made up," are likewise inclosed in marks of parenthesis, showing that their insertion is also the work of the publisher, and no part of the vision itself. Then we have, as the testimony of the vision, simply this: "I saw that the number of the Image Beast was made up." We now inquire what is meant by the "Image Beast?" We do not think it can refer to the two-horned beast, as there would seem to be no propriety in calling a beast an image beast, because it makes an image to another beast, any more than there would be in calling that the image beast, to which the image is made. We therefore incline to the view that by the expression "Image Beast," is meant the image which the two-horned beast makes to the first beast, and which he endows with life, causing it to speak, and attempt various other acts. Assuming that the image is what is referred to, though we assert nothing on the point either way, then it follows from the vision that this image has a number. It is certain that the first, or papal, beast, has a number, and his number is 666, as Rev. xiii, 18, plainly informs us; and it would not damage the likeness in any respect for the image of that beast to have a number also; whether the same or another would not matter. Doubtless more light will be given on this point as we approach the time of its fulfillment.

But it may be said, The vision asserts that the number was already made up in 1847. Nothing of the kind; for we are expressly carried forward to the time when we can neither buy nor sell without the mark of the beast, a period yet future, for the time when the number would be made up; and



as just remarked, as we approach that time, doubtless the developments of the prophecy will afford us a better understanding of this point. All we care to show here, is what we have shown, namely, that the number 666 which belongs to the first beast, is not the number that the vision here speaks of, though the one who published the vision, no doubt at the time sincerely supposed it was, and hence inserted the figures. And it does not matter that this vision, with the notes and explanations of the publisher above referred to, was incorporated by Bro. White into the "Word for the Little Flock," as the best interpretation they could then give to the points in question. It still remains a fact that the insertion of the figures was not a part of the vision itself. And the mistakes of an interpreter upon a point not definitely explained, must not be set down as a fault of the vision. The vision speaks of the number of the Image Beast, but does not tell us what that number is. It says nothing about the number 666, and hence does not apply it to any other beast but the papal beast, where the Scriptures place it. The objector has here suffered himself to be misled. Placed by the side of the facts, his objection disappears; and no discrepancy is found to exist between what this vision contains and what the REVIEW now teaches, or has at any time taught.

#### OBJECTION 39.—THE NEGRO RACE NOT HUMAN.

The visions teach, says the objector, that the negro race is not human. We deny it. They do not so teach. Mark the language: "Since the flood there has been amalgamation of man and beast, as may be seen in the almost endless varie-

ties of species of animals, and in certain races of men." This view was given for the purpose of illustrating the deep corruption and crime into which the race fell, even within a few years after the flood, that signal manifestation of God's wrath against human wickedness. There was amalgamation; and the effect is still visible in certain races of men." Mark, those excepting the animals upon whom the effects of this work are visible, are called by the vision, "men." Now we have ever supposed that anybody that was called a *man*, was considered a human being. The vision speaks of all these classes as races of *men*; yet in the face of this plain declaration, they foolishly assert that the visions teach that some men are not human beings! But does any one deny the general statement contained in the extract given above? They do not. If they did, they could easily be silenced by a reference to such cases as the wild Bushmen of Africa, some tribes of the Hottentots, and perhaps the Digger Indians of our own country, &c. Moreover, naturalists affirm that the line of demarkation between the human and animal races is lost in confusion. It is impossible, as they affirm, to tell just where the human ends and the animal begins. Can we suppose that this was so ordained of God in the beginning? Rather has not sin marred the boundaries of these two kingdoms? But, says the objector, Paul says that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," and then they add, "Which shall we believe, Paul or E. G. White?" You need not disbelieve E. G. White, in order to believe Paul; for there is no contradiction between them. Paul's language will apply to all classes of men who have any of the original Adamic blood



in their veins; and that there are any who have not this, is not taught by the visions, nor claimed by any one. But for this text to weigh anything in favor of the objector, he must take the ground that God made every particle of blood that exists in any human being. Is this so? Then God made all the scrofulous, leprous, or syphilitic blood that courses in the worst transgressor's veins! From any view which leads to such a blasphemous conclusion, we prefer to be excused.

But what has the ancient sin of amalgamation to do with any race or people at the present time? Are they in any way responsible, or to be held accountable for it? Not at all. Has any one a right to try to use it to their prejudice? By no means. The fact is mentioned simply to show how soon men relapsed into wickedness, and to what a degree. But we are to take all races and peoples as we find them. And those who manifest sufficient powers of mind to show that they are moral and accountable beings, are of course to be esteemed as objects of regard and philanthropic effort. We are bound to labor, so far as in our power, for the improvement of their mental, moral, and physical condition. Whatever race of men we may take, Bushmen, Hottentots, Patagonians, or any class of people, however low they may apparently be in the scale of humanity, their mental capabilities are in every instance the basis on which we are to work, and by which we determine whether they are subjects of moral government or not. Then what about all this ado over the charge, which is itself false, that the visions teach that the negro is not a human being? What does it amount to? It is simply an effort to create prejudice in the minds of the people, unworthy any one who

makes any pretensions to being a Christian, or even a gentleman.

#### OBJECTION 40.—BABEL BEFORE THE FLOOD.

A point occurs on p. 301 of *Spiritual Gifts*, Vol. iii, concerning which several good brethren have written, not as the objector, to find fault and pick flaws, but for information. The language is concerning the system of sacrificial offerings which was established with Adam after the fall, and reads as follows: "This system was corrupted before the flood by those who separated themselves from the faithful followers of God and engaged in the building of the tower of Babel." An unfortunate typographical error which has crept in here, makes the language place the building of the tower of Babel before the flood. After the word "flood," a comma and the word "and," have been left out. It should read thus: "This system was corrupted before the flood, and by those who separated themselves from the faithful followers of God, and engaged in the building of the tower of Babel [after the flood, of course, understood]. It is a statement simply, that both before and after the flood, the system of sacrifices was corrupted by mankind.

#### OBJECTION 41.—THE TABLES OF STONE.

"In the ark was the golden pot of manna, Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of stone which folded together like a book. Jesus opened them, and I saw the ten commandments written on them with the finger of God. On one table were four, on the other six." *Experience & Views*,



page 16. This, says the objector, contradicts Ex. xxxii, 15, which reads, "The tables were written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other were they written." He interprets this passage to mean that both sides of each table were written over, and that the vision asserts that only one side of each was written upon; and hence he claims a contradiction. The vision does not say that the writing was confined to one side of each table; but for the sake of making an objection, we will grant that it does. Then we would ask the objector if he is sure that the language of Moses is meant to convey the idea that both tables were written on both sides; for it will be noticed that the expression does not directly affirm this. On Ex. xxxii, 15, Dr. Clarke remarks:

"*The tables were written on both their sides.*"] If we take this literally, it was certainly a very unusual thing; for in ancient times, the two sides of the same substance were never written over. However some rabbins suppose that by the writing on both sides is meant the letters were *cut through* the tables, so that they might be read on both sides, though on one side they would appear reversed."

Not a very plausible supposition, we think. Scott, on the same passage, remarks:

"*On both their sides.*"] This is differently interpreted. Some think that the ten commandments were written on only one side of each table, part on the one, and part on the other; so that they might close together as a book when laid in the ark; but others are of opinion that each table was written on both sides."

Prof. Bush, who stands at the head of his profession as a Hebrew scholar, and who is therefore

well qualified to judge of the meaning of the original, is still more definite, and says:

"The two tables were probably designed to close together like the lids of a book, and by their being written on both sides is meant that their right and left hand leaf or side, were each of them to be occupied with letters.—*Note on Exodus xxxii, 15.*

On these authorities, we see that there is perfect harmony between the visions and the Bible on this point.

#### OBJECTION 42.—THE MARK OF THE BEAST.

Sunday-keeping, according to her visions, is the mark of the beast, and yet she had visions while keeping Sunday, and was never informed while thus in communion with Heaven that she had the mark of the beast, nor that God was displeased with her therefor; and further, the first and second angels of Rev. xiv, "had the mark of the beast; for they were Sunday-keepers. Would God send out two angels with the mark of the beast on them? Just think of two God-commissioned angels, doing the work of God, and all the while wearing the mark of the beast. Dare we charge all this against the God of Heaven, to make a sickly theory look plausible, and to prop up the visions of a modern prophetess?"

Thus reasons the objector; and no doubt to the uninformed it all looks very plausible, and will work admirably in stirring up prejudice strong and deep, according to its evident design. The fault we find with it is, it is altogether founded in misrepresentation and falsehood; and could we satisfy ourselves that it was not done willfully, we



should feel the more lenient toward it. This objection, as set forth above, appeared a few months since in the *Voice of the West*; but as far back as 1864, in a little friendly controversy with that paper, we distinctly defined our position on this point, as follows:

"In relation to our application of the third angel's message, the worship of the beast and his mark, we are almost uniformly misrepresented. We do not make the sweeping application, as above asserted, that 'this [the doom threatened by the third angel] is the terrible fate of all Sunday-keepers.' We do not accuse all Sunday-keepers of worshipping the beast or of having his mark, in the sense of that prophecy. What we do say is this: that when the light comes, those who willfully shut their eyes to the truth, and deliberately adopt an institution of the beast in place of one which God has given us, having been fully informed that it is such, thereby transfer their allegiance and worship from God to the beast, and then become subjects of the fearful threatening of that message."—*Review, Vol. xxiv, No. 14.*

But notwithstanding all this, we find the charge reiterated in the same paper, that according to our view all Sunday-keepers have, and for years in the past, have had, the mark of the beast. If they will not take our explanation, and without any effort to show that the distinction we make is not just, still persist in misrepresenting us, they must bear the responsibility of such a course. Let our position, here, be distinctly understood. True, we hold Sunday-keeping to be the mark of the beast; but no Sunday-keeper, past or present, has *received* the mark in the sense of the third message, however strictly he may have observed the

day, if not keeping it with an understanding that it was such mark, or as enforced by the power that instituted it, as a sign or token of its authority. The third message pertains to a future test which is to be made on this question. It is given at a time when the first day of the week is, and has been for years, almost universally observed; yet mark its phraseology: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark," &c. But how absurd to warn people against receiving the mark, if they already have it. The wording of the message, then, shows that it is something which they will be required to receive in the future, and which it is given to guard them against. Man says, Receive the mark, or die. Rev. xiii, 15. God says, Refuse it, or drink of my unmingled wrath. Rev. xiv, 9, 10. And when, with this issue before them, men shall seek to save their lives, by surrendering the truth, and deliberately receive an institution of the beast in place of, and as opposed to, a commandment of God, then they receive the mark of the beast, and expose themselves to the unmingled wrath of God. To say, therefore, that according to our view, Luther, Wesley, Fletcher, Whitefield, or any of the good of past ages, or those who gave the first and second messages of Rev. xiv, had the mark of the beast, is simply false, and the objector has only wasted his ink in trying to fix this stigma upon the visions.

But why was not this sooner shown to be wrong? We answer, Why was not all truth given to the race in the beginning? Especially at the opening of this dispensation, why was not all truth pertaining to it, at once revealed and placed in the hands of the church? The Lord of truth was personally



with his disciples, instructing them in the things of the gospel. Why did he not tell them everything at once? Why let an interview close with errors still resting on their minds? But hear him: "I have yet *many* things to say to you, but ye cannot *bear* them now." Light comes just as the people of God are ready for it, and are prepared to use it in the development of character. And light on the Sabbath question, as a matter of prophecy, came forth in its proper time, when the temple of God was opened in Heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament. Rev. xi, 19.

OBJECTION 43.—THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

It is claimed that the visions locate the second coming of Christ in the past? Why? Because in *Spiritual Gifts*, Vol. i, pages 73-4, it is stated that immediately after his resurrection, when he had told Mary not to touch him, for he had not then ascended to God, he did ascend to Heaven, received from the lips of the Father the acceptance of his sacrifice, and returned the same day to his disciples. In his zeal to make this an objection to the vision, the objector forgot to guard against making it an objection to the Bible also, by telling us what John xx, 17, does mean, if it does not mean that. How could Christ consistently refuse to let Mary touch him, *because* he had not yet ascended to his Father, and afterward bid the disciples handle him, Luke xxiv, 39, if he still had not ascended? or how could he request Mary to go and tell his disciples that he ascended to his God and their God, unless he was to make that ascension before he himself should see them?

for then he could inform them himself. But we will waive this point, and proceed to the objection. If he ascended and returned, it is claimed that such return must be his second coming; but Paul locates the second coming in the future, hence, in the sneering dialect of the opposer, Paul and Ellen clash. But we inquire, was the ascension of which John xx, 17, speaks, or, if the objector prefers, of which the visions speak, visible to the world? Did any one then see him ascend? No. Did any one see him return? No. But can any one fail to see that when we speak of the first and second advents of Christ, we mean his outward, visible appearance among men? "To them that look for him shall he *appear* the second time," not come secretly or invisibly. And does this declaration preclude the idea of his passing any number of times between earth and Heaven, unknown to the world? Of course not. And further, does the objector suppose that Christ is immovable, fixed to a particular locality in Heaven, and that he has never been personally present on this earth except during his earthly ministry? If so, he will please excuse us from taking so contracted and unworthy a view of his position.

But waiving all these points, let us see how the objector will get along in his position with the Bible. Take Paul's experience. On his way to Damascus, the Lord met him and caused him to fall to the earth by the brightness of his presence. He told him plainly that he was Jesus of Nazareth whom he persecuted. The men who were with him heard the voice, but saw no man. Acts ix, 7. By this language, Paul plainly shows that he did see Jesus who spoke with him. But Paul, in 1 Cor. xv, speaking of those by whom the Lord



was seen after his resurrection, says, verse 8, "Last of all he *was seen* of me also, as of one born out of due time." Again, chap. ix, 1: "Am I not an apostle? am I not free? have I not *seen* Jesus Christ our Lord?" And Ananias said to him on reaching Damascus, "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and *see* that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth." Acts xxii, 14. Thus the Lord Jesus came down from Heaven, met Saul in the way, revealed to him his person, and spoke to him with an audible voice, which even the men who were with him heard, though they understood not. It will be in vain to urge that the Lord was not really present, because Paul speaks of it as a heavenly vision; for this term is in such instances applied to real literal appearances, as when the women went to the sepulcher and beheld a vision of angels; that is, angels who were really and literally present. Luke xxiv, 23. Now let us apply a little of the objector's reasoning: Did not Christ return to earth when he met Saul in the way? "Yes. And does not this return to earth, in connection with his first coming, make a second coming? Just as truly as one and one make two. There is no escape from this conclusion. No squirming or dodging will help the matter in the least." But Paul long after this spoke of Christ's coming the second time in the future. So the objector here has Paul against Paul.

Again, the objector's view would place the first advent of Christ ages before the opening of the present dispensation; for once at least, in the days of Daniel, he came down to earth to assist Gabriel in influencing the king of Persia to take a course which would fulfill the prayer of that

prophet. So if any visit of Christ to this world counts one in a numerical order, the appearance of Christ as a babe in the manger, a teacher of the people, and a sacrifice on Calvary, was not by any means his first advent to this world.

Having now found the objector, in his efforts here to frame an argument against the visions, in trouble with both Daniel and Paul, we leave him to settle his difficulty, as best he can, with those holy men.

#### OBJECTION 44.—IMPARTING POWER TO DISCIPLES.

"According to this vision," it is objected, "Jesus wished to return to his disciples, after having ascended to Heaven, and 'WHILE WITH THEM impart power unto them,' whereas the Bible informs us that he bade them 'tarry at Jerusalem,' after his ascension, till they were 'endued with power from on high.' Thus . . . he did NOT 'while with them impart power unto them;' but shortly after his ascension (on the day of Pentecost), the promised power came. Here Ellen and the Bible disagree."

We can but ask, in charity, if the objector never read John xx, 22, which states that Jesus, on the evening of the day of his resurrection, met with his disciples, and breathing on them, said, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost!* Thus he did impart power unto them. He begat them to a lively hope, by showing himself to them, "speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," and breathing on them the Holy Ghost. This is all that the vision asserts. Hence, "here Ellen and the Bible" do not "disagree." The "promise of the Father,"



for which he told them to wait at Jerusalem, is another thing.

OBJECTION 45.—SEVEN DAYS ASCENDING.

“We all entered the cloud together, and were seven days ascending to the sea of glass.” Experience & Views, page 12. Yet Christ on the day of his resurrection, ascended and returned in a part of a day. Here, says the objector, one vision teaches that it takes seven days to make the journey to the New Jerusalem, or fourteen days to go and return, and another vision teaches that Christ performed this fourteen days’ journey in less than one day. The two visions, he is very confident, cannot be harmonized. We reply, the vision does not say that it takes on every occasion seven days to ascend to the city. It only states that on one particular instance, when Christ takes up the redeemed hosts, this length of time, for what reason we know not, was occupied in the ascension. There is nothing in this to show that celestial beings, Christ and his angels, may not accomplish the distance in an instant. In Daniel’s prayer recorded in Dan. ix, which would occupy but a few moments in delivery down to the 20th verse, the angel Gabriel appeared to him and said that at the beginning of his supplications the commandment came forth, and he was then come to show him; that is, when he commenced to pray, Gabriel was ordered to go to him; and when he had prayed but a few minutes at longest, there stood Gabriel before him in fulfillment of his mission, having accomplished the distance from Heaven to earth, in the short time that it took Daniel to utter a few words of prayer! This ob-

jection is simply a silly quibble. We feel like asking the reader’s pardon for noticing it. We should not have done so, had it not been urged with ridiculous gravity as a proof that the visions are unreliable.

OBJECTION 46.—MESMERISM.

“I told him the Lord had shown me that mesmerism was from the Devil.” Experience and Views, page 6. “Phrenology and mesmerism are very much exalted. They are good in their place.” Testimony No. 7, page 56. Here the objector stops and claims a contradiction. Mesmerism from the Devil, he says, and yet good! He should have continued his quotation from Testimony No. 7, a little further, thus: “They are good in their place, but they are seized upon by Satan as his most powerful agents to deceive and destroy souls!” It is only by garbling the sentence that the opposer finds his objection; for when it is given in full, it explains the first quotation, and shows in what respect mesmerism is from the Devil, namely, in the use that is made of it. This is all made plain in the work last quoted from.

OBJECTION 47.—HEROD.

“Herod’s heart grew still harder, and when he heard that Jesus had arisen, he was not much troubled. He took the life of James; and when he saw that this pleased the Jews, he took Peter also, intending to put him to death.” Spiritual Gifts, Vol. i, page 11. Here, says the objector, she makes out that the same Herod that was concerned in the trial of Jesus, was the one that put



James to death. This statement is not true. We ask, How does the Bible speak of these Herods? Simply as Herod. It is Herod at the trial of Christ, and Herod at the death of James. We go to history to learn the distinction between them. But it may be said, the pronoun, he, is used referring directly to the Herod first mentioned. Very well, we have already produced an instance from the Bible where the pronoun, he, refers to Satan, when the only expressed antecedent is the Lord. See page 35. But let us look at these Herods. We shall find that they were alike in more respects than in name. What Herod put James to death? Herod Agrippa I. Who was this Herod? Nephew and brother-in-law of Herod Antipas, who took part in the trial of Christ. He was raised to power in A. D. 38, and it was at his instigation that, three years later, in A. D. 41, Antipas was banished to Lyons, and Agrippa succeeded to his throne. He also pursued the same course toward the Christians as Antipas. This is proved by his persecution of the disciples. Moreover he must have understood fully the position and claims of the Christians, inasmuch as his son, Agrippa II., on succeeding to his father's government, years afterward, became so fully acquainted with them, that Paul addressed him in the following confident language respecting the sufferings of Christ, and his resurrection from the dead: "For the king knoweth of these things, before whom also I speak freely; for I am persuaded that none of these things are hidden from him; for this thing was not done in a corner!"

Then here we have Agrippa succeeding his uncle Antipas, in the government, succeeding him in disposition, succeeding him in the same course of ac-

tion toward the Christians, and well acquainted with all the facts in reference to Christ, so that they should have had as much effect on him as upon his uncle and predecessor, Antipas. Then why not associate them together as one link in the Herodian dynasty, as well as to speak of a succession of kings as constituting one horn of a beast, as in the case of the four horns of the goat, or to take a succession of popes to represent a single man of sin?

#### OBJECTION 48.—THE MARTYRS.

"They raised the sword to kill us, but it broke and fell powerless as a straw." Experience and Views, page 17. This is spoken of those who refuse to worship the beast and his image; but, says the objector, these persons according to John are killed. Rev. xx, 4. And I saw thrones and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." The trouble with the objector here is, this text does not mean what he would like to have it. John does not here say that those who were beheaded were those who had refused to worship the beast or his image; for the words "and which had not worshiped," &c., should be rendered, "and those who had not worshiped," &c. Here a special class, in distinction from the martyrs, is pointed out. Then, says the objector, this would include millions of sinners. It might, perhaps, if John had not plainly informed



us in the preceding chapter, that all of this class had just been slain by the sword of him that sat upon the horse. Mark the company presented to John. The wicked had all been slain, but the righteous dead had been raised, and of course the righteous living changed. This multitude of immortalized righteous ones, are the persons and the only persons, here spoken of by the prophet. And he singles out two classes of these and makes special mention of them: the martyrs, as one class, and those who had not worshipped the beast, &c., as the other. He does not class those who refuse to worship the beast and his image, among the martyrs. Hence there is no proof here that this class are to be slain, and nothing whatever to conflict with the vision on this point.

OBJECTION 49.—SEEING WICKED PERSONS IN HEAVEN.

It is alleged that Mrs. W. has seen certain ones in the kingdom who are living lives of notorious wickedness, and who probably will never reform and be saved; and this it is urged should be sufficient to show that the visions are entitled to no confidence. This objection we are obliged to meet as we have many that have preceded it; namely, with an unqualified denial; that is, in the light in which it is presented by the objector, it is false. She has indeed seen certain individuals who are outside the pale of truth, and seen that if they would pursue such and such a course, they would be saved. Under such circumstances she has seen them in the kingdom. She has never seen any person unconditionally there; and if they comply with the conditions shown, they will ultimately be there; if

they do not, they will fail; and then all that can be made of the vision will be that it showed them an offer of life on conditions with which they never complied. Thus a partial statement of the truth is made to do the work of an absolute falsehood.

OBJECTION 50.—CHRIST'S ENTRY INTO THE HOLY PLACE.

The visions represent that Christ entered into the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844. The objector here finds a contradiction by asserting that Christ entered the holiest over 1800 years ago; and this is the way he attempts to prove it:

"1. What is Christ's office in this dispensation? Answer—High Priest. 2. Where did the high priest, in the type, go to officiate once a year? Answer—Into the department which Paul calls the 'holy place:' 'The high priest entered into the holy place every year.' Heb. ix, 25. 3. Into what place did Christ enter 1800 years ago? Answer—Into the 'holy place' (Heb. ix, 12)—a place bearing the same name of the place into which Paul says the high priest entered, in the type, elsewhere called the most holy place or holiest; and to forever obliterate the impression that Christ did not enter the holiest or 'most holy place,' 1800 years ago, Paul talks to his brethren about having *boldness to enter into the HOLIEST* by the blood of Jesus,' (Heb. x, 19), which would have been an impossibility *provided* Christ had not gone there himself till 1844."

The writer of the foregoing wonderful argument, has a great passion for flourishing the original Greek, when he thinks it favors his position, but



is significantly silent with regard to it, when it goes against him. In every instance where he has mentioned the holy place or holiest in the preceding argument, it is in the original in the *plural*, and should be rendered, *holy places*. Thus Heb. ix, 25, reads, "The high priest entereth into the holy places every year, with the blood of others." Heb. ix, 12, reads, "By his own blood he entered in once [once for all, Gr.] into the *holy places*." True it is "a place bearing the same name as the place into which the high priest entered in the type;" but the name is in the plural, and so completely spoils the objector's argument. So when Paul talks to his brethren about having boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus," it is still plural, and should be rendered holy places. It proves that Christ is a minister in both apartments of the heavenly sanctuary, and that we, through the merits of his blood, can find in him a High Priest and Saviour in the most holy as well as in the holy place, in the second, as well as in the first, apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. The reader has but to know the fact that in the texts quoted the words are in the plural, meaning holy places, and the objector's arguments at once vanish, either as a piece of bad criticism, or an effort to mislead.

Another quotes Heb. vi, 19, 20, and says that Paul was incorrect if our High Priest did not enter within the veil till 1844. This writer forgot that the first apartment of the sanctuary was closed with a veil as well as the second, and that when Christ entered into the first apartment he entered within the veil, as truly as when he entered into the second.

## OBJECTION 51.—THE HIGH PRIEST'S DRESS.

In a description of events to occur at the end of the 2300 days in 1844, we read, in Spir. Gifts, Vol. i, page 159: "Jesus then clothed himself with precious garments. Around the bottom of his robe was a bell and a pomegranate, a bell and a pomegranate. He had suspended from his shoulders a breastplate of curious work," &c. Being thus attired, he went into the most holy place to cleanse the sanctuary. This, says the objector, was contrary to the type; for Aaron on the day of atonement, when he went in to the most holy place, was to lay off his gorgeous priestly robes, and array himself in plain linen garments. Lev. xvi, 4. Hence he affirms that the representation of the vision on this point is not correct. We reply, Paul says that the law had only a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things. We must not look for absolute identity in every respect. He points out a number of particulars in which the parallel between the earthly and heavenly priesthood does not hold, on account of the imperfection and mortality of the earthly priests. When we look at the point before us, we find this to be, in all probability, one of the same nature.

Dr. Clarke has the following note on Lev. xvi, 4: "He [the high priest] was not to dress in his *pontifical* garments, but in the simple sacerdotal vestments, or those of the Levites, because it was a day of *humiliation*; and as he was to offer sacrifices for his *own sins*, it was necessary that he should appear in habits suited to the occasion. Hence he has neither the *robe*, the *ephod*, the



*breastplate, the miter, &c.*; these constituted his dress of *dignity*, as the high priest of God, ministering for others, and the representative of Christ; but now he appears before God, as a *sinner*, offering an atonement for his transgressions, and his garments are those of humiliation."

How can this explanation be otherwise than satisfactory to any mind? The high priest in the earthly sanctuary being himself a sinner, and having to offer on the day of atonement for his own sins, could not appropriately appear in any other than robes of humility. But no such reason can exist in the case of Christ; hence there can be no occasion with him for such a change of garments. He could appropriately wear in the second apartment robes even more gorgeous and precious than those in which he ministered in the first apartment. And it is most derogatory to the character of Christ to claim that because the priest on earth put on plain linen robes, in token of his own sin and humiliation, therefore our immortal and sinless great High Priest, in the sanctuary in Heaven, must do the same! No one has any occasion to find fault with what has been shown on this point.

#### OBJECTION 52.—SUPPRESSION.

We now come to the great outcry about suppression. This the reader will at once understand cannot be urged as an objection against the visions themselves. If any wrong has been committed in this direction, it lies at the door of those who have had the charge of their publication. But there are charges made here which are infamously false. The visions are accused of following the views of the people; and as our views change, the visions

must change to correspond; and if they cannot be changed they must be suppressed. To use the objector's own language, "All such visions are put where it is not an easy matter to get hold of them. Had it been possible they would long ago have destroyed them." We pronounce this an unvarnished, malicious falsehood; and those who make it, and those who love it, are respectfully referred to Rev. xxii, 15. They cannot produce the first particle of evidence that there has ever been any attempt or design on the part of the leaders in this work to suppress any of the visions. Having once published them and spread them through the ranks of believers, any one could see that it would be sheer folly to attempt any such thing. No; be it understood that we stand by everything that has been shown. And what is the great proportion of that which is charged upon us as suppression? Simply matter that has been once published, and the edition becoming exhausted, has not been republished. Now is there any law compelling us to keep on hand an edition of every vision that has ever been published? We certainly wish we had them, and could put them on sale at this office. But because the editions are all exhausted, Oh, says the silly charge, they are now suppressed! This might just as well be said of every book that chances to be out of print.

But in such visions as have been re-published, portions have been omitted. How is that? Very well. It not unusually happens that much that is shown in vision has a special application to circumstances as they exist at the time the vision is given. Now when the vision has once been fully published and accomplished its object as far as existing circumstances are concerned, is it not per-



fectly right and proper to re-publish only such portions as are of importance and utility to subsequent times? All will concede that it is.

But it is claimed that objectionable features are left out because they are not now believed. In answering these objections thus far we have answered among others the very points which are claimed to have been suppressed, and shown that they contain nothing but what we now fully endorse; so that this objection so far is of no weight. But further, we can show that those points are no stronger than others which are retained; so that the objection fails in this respect also. The two principal points are these: Speaking of those who fell off from the Advent path to the world below, she says, "It was just as impossible for them to get on the path again and go to the city, as all the wicked world which God had rejected." Word to Little Flock, page 14. This is omitted on page 10 of Experience and Views. Was it because this point was not then believed? If so, look at another statement found on page 43 of the same work: She saw the world before the throne, and when Jesus rose up from the throne not one ray of light passed to the careless multitude, but they were left in perfect darkness. Now which expression is the stronger? We say the latter, or, at least, it is just as strong. The other point is in what was shown about false reformations: "The reformations that were shown me were not reformations from error to truth, but from bad to worse; for those who professed a change of heart had only wrapped about them a religious garb which covered up the iniquity of a wicked heart. Some appeared to have been really converted, so as to deceive God's people; but if their hearts could be

seen, they would appear as black as ever." As we have not proof to the contrary, we will take it for granted, as the objector claims, that these statements were published in the Present Truth, of August, 1849. Concerning their import we will only say that they do not prove that every conversion since 1844 has been spurious, as the objector asserts. They are speaking of the conversions made by these false revivals, which were not conversions from error to truth. It is not asserted that there could be no conversions from error to truth, and that such would not be genuine. The point now before us is, Were these statements omitted on page 27 of Experience and Views, because they were not believed, at the time the vision was re-published? We say, No; for expressions are retained which are still stronger. Thus: "The reformations that were shown me, were not reformations from error to truth. My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked but could not see it; for the time for their salvation is past." Concerning the expression, "The time for their salvation is past," and "the wicked world which God had rejected," we have already spoken and have no occasion to speak further here. We introduce them only to show that there are expressions retained in the visions, which viewed from the objector's standpoint, are far more objectionable than those which he claims are omitted on account of their objectionable features. Their omission, then, so far as any objection based on them against the visions is concerned, is a matter of complete indifference. The objector is therefore at liberty to make of it what he can.



Let us briefly recapitulate that the reader may look at all the facts in connection.

1. Every vision, except such as pertained exclusively to individual cases, has been once published, put in print, and indiscriminately circulated, where friend and foe could alike obtain them. Attempts to suppress any of these would be utterly futile.

2. The main body of what we are accused of having suppressed, is simply the editions of some visions, which, having all been sold, have not yet been re-published!

3. Portions which are claimed to have been suppressed from some evil design, are simply some things which related to particular and local circumstances, and having accomplished their object, have not been inserted when that which is of general interest has been re-published.

4. Expressions are retained inculcating the same sentiments, in language still stronger than those which the objector claims to have been suppressed on account of their objectionable features; so that the teachings of the visions are not altered a whit by the omission of those things which he asserts have been left out because they are not now believed.

5. In answering these objections we have answered all the points which are set forth as suppressions, and have shown that they contain nothing but what we still fully endorse.

6. If the objector could maintain his points, what would he prove? Nothing against the visions themselves, but only against those who have had charge of their publication.

In view of these facts this objection dwindles to a point that is not visible to the naked eye. And

all the assertions that certain visions are not now for sale at this office because we do not now believe them, or that there has been any effort made to call in visions for the purpose of suppressing them, or that if we could have got hold of them, they would long ago have been put out of the way, or anything of the kind, we brand as infamous calumnies, and bald and barefaced untruths.

We have now followed the objector through his list of objections against the visions, finding none of them valid, and most of them weak and puerile in the extreme. We might have left them, with no fears that any person of a pure and ingenuous spirit, and honest and upright heart, would have been permanently turned from the right path by their influence. But considerable vain and empty boasting may be stopped, by thus refuting them in order. Two things we have gained by this examination: First, a deeper knowledge of the inherent weakness of the opposition, and, second, clearer views of the beauty and harmony of the visions themselves.

One other point should perhaps be mentioned before closing. Some one may say, Then you make the visions a second New Testament, a Mormon Bible in your system. We do not, as the following reason will show: We have ever held, as set forth in this work, that the word of God, the Bible, is the great standard by which to test all these manifestations. "To the law and to the testimony. If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." All gifts of the Spirit in the church must be thus tested. Now it is evident that that which tests, occupies a higher position than that which is tested by it. This, in one word, expresses our view of the rela-



tive position which the Bible and the visions sustain to each other. But when a manifestation accords with the word, and gives every evidence that it is a genuine manifestation of the Spirit of God, we submit it to the objector himself to say how far we may regard it lightly or despise or transgress its teachings with impunity.

In conclusion, we would urge the reader to study Spiritual Gifts and Testimonies to the Church more fully, and endeavor to follow their teachings more closely. Those who do this to the greatest extent, exemplify most of the spirit of Christianity in their daily lives; and such have no doubts, and find no difficulties, in the visions. The objections all come from those who manifest the least of their spirit in their daily walk and conversation, and who are least acquainted with their manifestation.

And you who love the present truth, who feel your hearts swelling with gratitude, as you view the pit of darkness from which it has taken you, and the glorious light it has thrown upon your pathway, remember that the visions are intimately and inseparably connected with this work. We have yet to learn of any one who has given up the visions, who has not also given up the main pillars of present truth. How is it with those who have lately risen up in opposition in Iowa? They have already surrendered the great truths of the Three Messages, the Two-horned Beast, the reckoning of the prophetic periods, and consequently the Sanctuary work in Heaven. How long they will retain even the Sabbath, or any practical view of the doctrine of the second advent, time will determine. Are you willing to follow the guidance of such men?

To thus endeavor to defend what the Lord has

expressly and in mercy set in his church, against the attacks of unreasonable and faithless men, has been to us a pleasing task. The effort is but a faint index of the gratitude we feel for the precious gift which is among us. May the Lord add his blessing to make it of benefit to those who read. May he help you to "prove all things," and "hold fast that which is good." May he enable you to heed the injunction, "to despise not prophesyings;" and may you "*come behind in no gift,*" waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

---

## APPENDIX.

---

### Number One.

We present the following testimonies, which we have the permission of the writer to insert here, to show how opposition to the visions, personal considerations aside, springs from prejudice, and exists only with those who have little or no acquaintance with the one through whom they are given, and also the impossibility of obtaining anything like justice or fairness from our opponents on this question. Bro. Ball had for quite a length of time been engaged in strenuous and public warfare against the visions, sending his communications to various papers, which were all eager to insert them, when Bro. and Sr. White made a visit to Washington, N. H., in December, 1867, and he had the privilege of forming a personal acquaintance with



them, witnessing how the Spirit of God attended their labors, and happily of sharing in a measure therein himself. The result we will let him describe in his own words. The following from his pen was published in the REVIEW of July 7, 1868:

“A CONFESSION.

“With deep humility would I confess to the readers of the REVIEW my errors and mistakes in opposing what I now regard as the work of God. For more than two years I have been engaged in open warfare against certain positions held by our seventh-day brethren. My object has been to tear down, to dishearten, discourage, and cause doubt and unbelief everywhere (so far as my influence extends,) among this people. I have also put forth my best efforts to prejudice and influence first-day Adventists against this people and their views. I now see my mistake, and deeply feel my wrong course in so doing. Nothing but Satan himself could induce me to engage in such an unholy warfare. I have been blinded by his dark influence, and controlled by his satanic power, while warring against the people of God. All this I frankly and humbly confess. I am guilty before God of a great sin, in uniting my influence and talents with the rebel hosts in opposing God's chosen people, who keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ. I humbly ask the forgiveness of God and my brethren for the wrongs I have committed while engaged in this rebellious work.

“Especially do I feel the wrong done Bro. and Sr. White; and would again ask their forgiveness. I shall ever hold them in grateful remembrance

for their plain, cutting, and faithful testimonies to me, during their visit to our place last winter. They were instrumental, by the blessing of God, in rescuing me from the snare of the Devil. I bless God for sending his faithful servants this way, and for his Spirit which attended their faithful labors. The Lord worked with them in power, not only in reclaiming the erring and backslidden, but in the conversion of sinners to God. A great and good work commenced under their faithful labors, and is still going forward. To God be all the praise.

“As it regards the testimonies of Sr. White, I became partially convinced, during their visit to our place, that they were from God. Since then my conviction has been widening and deepening, until I can truthfully say that I believe Sr. White is an humble, devoted, godly woman; and that her testimonies are from Heaven. I cannot, yea, I will not doubt, for darkness is sure to follow. It is the united testimony of all who have had any experience in the matter, that the more confidence they have in Sr. White and her testimonies, the more they enjoy the blessing of God. This has been my own experience. Now why is this? Does the Lord bless people more for believing error than truth? If so, the more confidence and faith we can get in the doctrine of modern spiritualism, or any other satanic delusion, the more of the blessing of Heaven we shall enjoy. What an idea!

“Who are the most humble, devoted, self-sacrificing, godly persons to be found among Sabbath-keepers? Do they comprise that class who are doubting, halting, questioning, disbelieving, and fighting the visions? *Certainly not.* This class are noted for their selfishness, their worldly-mindedness, and their lack of consecration to God



and his cause. They are the lukewarm, the half-hearted, the backslidden class, among Sabbath-keepers. This fact alone should teach us that God is in this work, and no weapon raised against it can prosper. My own sad experience has taught me that it is *spiritual death* to doubt or oppose any part of this work. God's hand is set to the work, and it is destined to triumph, although men and devils may oppose.

"I feel very unworthy of a place or name among this people. My life, during the past two years, has been both an injury and a disgrace to the cause of God. I would, in view of my wrongs, deeply humble myself before God, and seek forgiveness for all my sins, while Jesus pleads the merits of his own precious blood in my behalf. I desire, as far as possible, to counteract my wrong influence, and shall labor to this end. My faith, sympathies, and interests are now with this people; and I hope never again to turn traitor, but find some humble place among them, where what little influence I may have shall not be to tear down, but to build up. I feel an earnest desire to enlist all my energies in righting my wrongs. And I hope, dear brethren and sisters, not only to obtain your forgiveness, but to have your prayers, that I may be kept from the deceptive power of Satan in these last days.

"From your erring brother,

"W. H. BALL.

"Washington, N. H."

Having become fully convinced that the work in which he had been engaged was a work of wrong and error, like an honest man, Bro. B. immediately set about undoing as far as possible the influ-

ence that he had cast. To this end he wrote retractions to be inserted in the various papers in which his articles had appeared. The following was sent to the *Voice of the West*, the organ through which he had chiefly spoken, but was peremptorily refused admission, the editor promising to do him justice before his readers in a note of his own. Under the heading of "Change of Views," Bro. B. wrote:

"BRO. HIMES: I wish to say through the columns of the *Voice*, to its numerous readers who have read my attacks against the positions held by S. D. Adventists, and more especially my warfare against the visions, that my views have during the past six months undergone a happy change.

"During the past winter Bro. and Sr. White visited our place, and I had the privilege of presenting my objections to the visions to Sr. W. in person. And the explanation I received upon many points was, I am happy to state, perfectly satisfactory. They were successful, by the blessing of God, in removing not only several objections, but a large amount of prejudice from my mind.

"The Spirit and power of God which attended the labors of these faithful servants, is the best of evidence that God is with them of a truth. The Lord worked with them in great power, until nearly all the children of Sabbath-keepers enlisted in the service of God. No one, it would seem, could form even a short acquaintance with Sr. W. without being forced to the conclusion that she is a humble, devoted, godly woman, if there is one to be found upon the earth. And I feel that I am guilty before God of a great wrong in raising my



voice against the testimonies of this humble instrument.

"It is my settled conviction, not only from the sad experience I have had in this matter, but from daily observation, that no weapon raised against the testimonies of this godly woman, can prosper. God's frown and not his blessing, will attend all such efforts. If others think they can fight the visions, and enjoy the favor of Heaven at the same time, they can try it. But for one I am satisfied with this kind of work. I pray God to forgive me my errors in this direction.

"I also feel that I have committed a great wrong in holding up S. D. Adventists and their views to scorn and ridicule before their enemies. That my articles have partaken too much of the spirit of war, is too evident. What if our S. D. Adventist brethren do hold some errors! Where is there a people who do not? I am bold to affirm that there is no class of people to be found that have more truth than S. D. Adventists. There is no people to be found that are putting forth greater efforts to gain the immortal inheritance than S. D. Adventists. There is no people who are more zealous to get right in the sight of God, and keep all his commandments (the fourth not excepted), and get ready for translation, than S. D. Adventists. There is no people who are trying to conform to the laws of their being, so as to possess healthy bodies and clear minds, like S. D. Adventists. In short, there is no people I should be willing to cast in my interests with, but S. D. Adventists.

"In view of these facts, how wicked and unchristian the act to take the faults of this people (if faults they have), and hold them up to the gaze of those who disregard the law of God, the great rule

of right, the perfect standard by which men are to be judged in the last day. Jas. ii, 12.

"I feel deeply my wrong in warring against my seventh-day brethren. I have been led on by Satan in this unholy work, until I fear my influence has turned souls away from the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. I wish to counteract, as far as possible, my wrong influence, and would deeply humble myself before God, and seek forgiveness for all my wrongs, while Jesus pleads in behalf of the sins and errors of his people.

"W. H. BALL.

"Washington, N. H."

Instead of the "justice" promised by the editor of the *Voice*, he gave in his next issue the following brief and indefinite paragraph:

"CHANGE OF VIEWS.

"Bro. W. H. Ball, who has several times spoken very effectively through the *Voice* against 'the visions and theories of the prophetess, Ellen G. White,' writes us that he has changed his views. He declares himself sorry that he ever wrote against the views, or the theories that rest upon them. The only reason he gives for his 'change of views' is, that he has had an interview with Mrs. White, who explained matters satisfactorily to him. We decline publishing his letter, because it is mainly a special pleading for Mrs. W. and her theories, rather than a justification of his own 'change of views.' We are sorry that Bro. B. has fallen into a delusion which has ensnared many."

This action on the part of the *Voice* is a fair illustration of the character of those papers which



are engaged in a bitter warfare against Sr. White and her work. They would fain deceive their readers with a wonderful profession of liberality; but when brought to the test, the falsity of their profession at once appears in the intense exclusiveness which they invariably manifest. While Bro. B. was writing articles against S. D. Adventists, against the visions, and against sister White, whatever might be the nature of the testimony, with the utmost avidity it gave them an insertion. But no sooner does he become convinced that he has been writing error and misrepresentation, and doing injustice to a devoted and humble servant of God, than the editor of the *Voice* refuses to give him the privilege of expressing his convictions through his paper, but with a kick and a sneer both against him and her, dismisses him from his columns. We leave that paper to harmonize such a course with its claim to fairness and honesty, as best it can.

The following is a copy of a confession sent by Bro. B. to the *World's Crisis*, and which that paper has not only failed to insert, but has not even deigned to notice in any manner:

"A CONFESSION.

"BRO. GRANT: As I have written several articles in the *Crisis*, which were designed to influence its readers against S. D. Adventists and their views, and which I see were also used against the Sabbath and the law of God; I wish now to confess my wrong in so doing. I love the Sabbath and the law of God, and the people who are keeping it. I have become satisfied that they are the people of God, and that he is with them indeed.

I ask forgiveness of God and my brethren for the wrong I have done in writing as I did.

"W. H. BALL."

Washington, N. H.

Number Two.

Those who have apostatized from S. D. Adventists, and taken up a warfare against the visions, have by a singular providence seemed compelled to come back before their final departure, and frankly confess that the work in which they were engaged was all of the Devil, and that they were led and actuated by his spirit. Such was the case, among others, with Messrs. Snook and Brinkerhoff. As these individuals have acted a more conspicuous part than others in this matter, it is but proper that the reader should have the privilege of perusing their testimony. Shortly after the visit of Bro. and Sr. White to Iowa, in July, 1865, Messrs. S. and B. prepared the following statements which appeared in the *REVIEW* of the 25th of the same month:

From B. F. Snook.

"BRO. WHITE: Permit me, an unworthy worm of the dust, to address the brethren and sisters as follows:

"1. I wish to relieve my mind before you, and my God, by confessing that I now feel that I have been led by the wicked One in my movements of late, especially in my opposition to the body. Apparent difficulties in relation to Sr. White's visions have been accumulating in my mind for some time. These were magnified by the enemy until doubts resulted in unbelief and rebellion. In this



distressed state of mind I attended the General Conference at Battle Creek, last May. While there, my mind was impressed that the church there was fast becoming conformed to the world. Without unbosoming myself to the brethren there, and calling for an explanation, I kept these matters to myself till I had a good opportunity to give vent to my feelings by publishing these matters which were a trial to me, to the brethren away from there. I am now convinced that the church at Battle Creek fellowship none of the extravagant fashions that I saw there, and I am now led to believe that they are doing what they can to live out the truth and preserve the waymarks of our faith.

"I wish to say to my good brethren and sisters of the Battle Creek church, that I do most deeply deplore this wrong, and humbly beg of them to forgive me. I also beg the pardon of Bro. and sister White for the influence that I have tried to exert against them on account of these things. I also entreat my brethren and sisters in Iowa to forgive me for talking these things to them, and thereby inflaming them to wrong feelings. I do most sorrowfully repent of this grievous wrong, and pray that God and my brethren may forgive me.

"2. I went to the Iowa Conference full of opposition and strongly fortified against Sr. White's visions. Bro. White took a bold, decided and thorough stand against my wrongs, and faithfully exposed them. And though my mind was very much blinded, the scales fell off and I began to see myself a poor, miserable and undone sinner. Awful conviction seized me, and I was unhappy day and night. Then God in mercy began to restore me from my crazy opposition, and I began

to realize that I was the wrong one. In my distress I determined to confess my sins. I thereupon felt relief; and at the first opportunity I began the work; and as my determinations were carried out, I felt the blessing of God return to me.

"I desired to make everything right so far as I could. But there were the visions so full of imaginary wrongs and difficulties, how could I get right on them? I listened to the mighty testimonies of Bro. and sister White, driven home to my heart by the power of God. Hard as I had made my heart, it had to break, and well up with many tears that gushed from my eyes. Thought I, can it be possible that these who speak with so much Spirit and power of God are deceivers, are impostors? No, no! Such a thing *cannot* be. God will not bless the Devil's servants with so much of his Spirit. I then felt the good Spirit of God upon my heart, and the more of that Spirit I felt, the better the visions appeared; and the discrepancies and difficulties soon began to take wings and fly away. I now believe firmly that the Devil was working upon me for my overthrow and ruin. But I rejoice that God directed Bro. and sister White this way. They truly have been instrumental in my salvation from the Devil's snare. I hereby entreat their pardon for the grievous trial and heart-rending anguish that I have so wickedly brought upon them. May all my brethren, and may God forgive me.

"3. I have also felt while in this state of darkness that I was hampered and chained, and longed for a freedom that I now see would result in anarchy and universal disorder. I felt that the General Conference Committee were too domineering,



and were fast becoming a kind of triune papacy. Let me say that I have no such feelings now. I believe that God is in our present system and arrangement of order, and my heart's desire is to conform to it unreservedly, and to live in subjection to God and my brethren of experience in this work. I do most heartily believe that this work, in all its parts, is the work of God, and by his divine aid, I am going to strive to be a more holy, humble and devoted man, that I, with mine, may go with this people to the kingdom of God.

"Your unworthy brother,

"B. F. S."

From W. H. Brinkerhoff.

"TO THE BATTLE CREEK CHURCH OF S. D. A. :  
*Brethren*—With feelings of my unworthiness and liability to run into the devices of the enemy of all good, I send to you the following confession. And although mere words cannot heal wounds that have been inflicted, yet I hope that by actions in the future I may cause the injuries inflicted to be healed.

"On the 16th of May, 1865, I visited your place to attend the General Conference, with my mind poisoned to a considerable extent against you, and hence I was on the lookout to see if I could not find something by which I might have the wherewith to reproach you.

"After the Conference, my mind being still more poisoned, when I arrived home I began to circulate impressions of what I had seen in Battle Creek, among my brethren in Iowa, such as that the church was getting proud, and fashionable, and were not following out the testimonies. I saw individuals with fashionable hats and bonnets, and

artificial in them, but did not stop to inquire whether they were of Battle Creek or not, but in my state of mind conveyed the idea that they were all of your place. Since I have come into a position where I could stop and reflect and investigate, I am satisfied that said insinuations and reflections were wrong, and that I have by my influence placed you in a false position before the brethren of Iowa.

"Brethren, I have been deeply under the influence of Satan, and in this condition, I have done you a great wrong and wounded the cause severely, and while you were so kind in taking care of me and providing for all my wants, I was preparing to inflict wounds upon you.

"Oh may God in mercy pity and forgive me that great wrong. Of all wrongs committed, none are more flagrant than mercies abused. Oh how could I do so! Yet I did it, I did it!

"In order that I may place you in your true position before the brethren, let me say that I was in the wrong, and not you. I think I can to-day survey the critical position I was in. And although I have acted so cruelly and altogether unwarranted toward you, and while I would not extenuate myself, yet permit me to say that I was poisoned in my mind toward you, and blinded by prejudice. Yet I ought not to have been in such a position. I should not have given place to the enemy.

"And now may I hope that when you see in me a consistent course of conduct, and that I am trying to make amends for my faults, I may hope for your forgiveness, and to be restored again to your confidence. I will try to find out my place in the message, and struggle more earnestly to live out



the truth. And may the Lord forgive me all my sins.

"To Bro. and sister White I would say, I have also deeply wronged you, and caused you much anguish of heart and mind. I have listened to reports against you, and although while at Battle Creek enjoying your hospitalities, I had a good opportunity to talk with you about said reports, I waited until I came home, then began to spread them, thus alienating the minds of the brethren away from you. I did not stop to investigate them, and while you were far away I was trying to injure you. Oh, why did I do so! You had never harmed me in any way.

"On the 30th of June I went to Pilot Grove to meet you and Bro. Loughborough, not as brethren, but as enemies; and while there trying to fight my own way through, you fully sustained your reputation as honest, consistent Christians under the third angel's message. Oh! I feel sad when I think how I have been working for the enemy. Can such wounds be healed! such stains be washed out! I am now fully satisfied that God is leading this people, and that the visit of Bro. and sister White, and Bro. Loughborough, was not only timely, but blessed of God, and under his guidance; and that great good has already resulted therefrom. I went there without any confidence in the testimonies of sister White, and also with doubts on our position in regard to the sanctuary. I would now say that my feet are taken out of the miry clay, and fixed upon the sure foundation of truth, the testimonies not excepted.

"And here I freely confess to you, that I have not only deeply injured you, but also the cause of truth. Words alone are a poor balm for wounds.

But if you can still regard me as a brother, though an erring one, I will try to adorn the truth I profess, with a godly walk and conversation in the future. And may the Lord forgive me my sins, and strengthen me in every good word and work.

"To the brethren in Iowa I would say, My feet had well nigh slipped, and I was fast losing sight of the landmarks of truth. You that I have had an influence upon while in this state of darkness and doubt, I ask your forgiveness. And let me here say, that my experience, though a sad one, has taught me that to doubt this truth, and the instrumentalities used to bring it out by the Lord, is to speedily lead one into the enemy's dark dominions, where he can be taken captive at his will. Oh, doubt not this truth. Fear not its ultimate results. Put not forth your hands to steady the ark, as I thought to do. And though angry waves may roll high, God will take care of this truth, and bless its upbuilders, and send confusion and weakness upon those who, like some people anciently, thought to stay the work of God. I shall try in the future to humbly follow on where the Lord may lead. Pray for me.

"Yours hoping for eternal life,

"W. H. B."

"Lisbon, Iowa, July 12, 1865."

Reader, you now have this subject before you in all its aspects. You have seen from the foregoing pages the nature of the opposition brought to bear against the visions. You have seen the results of engaging in such a work from the confessions of those who have tried it. Judge now for yourself on which side truth, fairness, candor and the Spirit of God are to be found. Had these



persons from whom we last quote, followed the light which was once more mercifully permitted to illuminate their minds, as evinced in their confessions, they might have again become firm and joyful in the truth. But rebellion entered into so deliberately, and from so little cause, is not easily cured. Well does the Bible liken it, 1 Sam. xv, 23, to the sin of witchcraft. Hence in a short time after penning their confessions, they plunged again into their former condition according to an expressive proverb quoted by the apostle, 2 Pet. ii, 22. The prediction uttered by Mr. B., in the close of his remarks quoted above, that God would send confusion and weakness upon those who engage in such a work, has been strikingly fulfilled in the cases of himself and sympathizers. We counsel those who are inclined to doubt and waver, to take warning from these men, and beware how in word or deed they oppose this work, lest haply they be found to fight against God. If it is of men, it will come to nought; but if it is of God, those who endeavor to overthrow it, will only meet with a miserable and eternal failure.



## Periodicals.

The Review AND Herald is Published Weekly at \$3.00 a year, in advance.  
The Youth's Instructor is Published Monthly at 50 cents a year, in advance.

## Books and Tracts.

The law requires the pre-payment of postage on Bound Books, four cents for the first four ounces, or fractional part thereof, and an additional four cents for the next four ounces, or fractional part thereof, and so on. On pamphlets and tracts, two cents for each four ounces, or fractional part thereof. Orders, to secure attention, must be accompanied with the Cash. Address J. M. ALDRICH, Battle Creek, Michigan.

	Price.	Weight.
		cts, oz.
The Bible from Heaven: Dissertation on Evidence of Christianity.	20	5
Review of Profiles—Bath Sides on the Sabbath and the Law.	20	5
Modern Spiritualism: an Exposure of its Nature and Tendency.	20	5
The Atonement: a Bible examination of the plan of salvation.	20	5
Ministration of Angels; origin, history and destiny of Satan, &c.	20	4
The Visions of Mrs. E. G. White; Objections Answered in full.	20	4
The Three Messages of Rev. xiv, and the Two-horned Beast.	15	4
Which? Mortal or Immortal? An Inquiry into Man's Condition.	15	4
The Kingdom of God, a Refutation of the Age-to-Come Theory.	15	4
Miraculous Powers: Illustrating the Prosperity of Spiritual Gifts.	15	4
Sanctification: or Living Holiness. by Eld. D. T. Bourdieu.	15	4
Prophecy of Daniel—Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days.	10	3
The Sancte Inheritance. Proved to be the Earth made New.	10	3
Signs of the Times, Showing the Coming of Christ at the Door.	10	3
The Law of God: Testimony of both Testaments on its Origin, &c.	10	3
Validation of the Tens Sabbath and Narrative, by J. W. Morton.	10	3
Review of Springs on the Sabbath, Law of God, and Sunday.	10	3
The Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days of Daniel viii.	10	3
Christian Baptism, showing its Nature, its Subjects, and Design.	10	3
Review of A. N. Seymour. His Fifth Law Question Answered.	10	3
Appeal to Mothers, on the Great Cause of Moral Degeneracy, &c.	10	3
Key to the Prophetic Chart of the Visions of Daniel and John.	10	3
The Commandments to Restore, and to Build Jerusalem.	10	3
The Seven Trumpets of Rev. xix, an exposition of their sounding.	10	3
Appeal to Youth: last sickness and death of Henry N. White, Ac.	10	4
A Brief Exposition of the Twenty-four Chapters of Matthew.	10	4
John Milton, Author of Paradise Lost, on the State of the Soul.	10	4
Appeal to the Baptists on the Sabbath, by the Tri-day Baptists.	10	4
The Mark of the Beast, and the Seal of the Living God.	10	4
The Bible Student's Assistant, a Compend of Scripture References.	10	4

Also, two packages of tracts, carefully assorted, which will be sent post-paid for 50 cents and \$1.00 each.

## Bound Books.

Life Incidents; a most interesting and valuable book for all.	1.00	16
Thoughts on Revival; critical and explanatory notes, &c.	1.00	12
How to Live; valuable instructions on preservation of health.	1.00	12
Autobiography of Eld. Joseph Bates with portrait.	1.00	12
History of the Sabbath. Part I. Bible Hist.—II. Secular Hist.	.80	12
Physiology and Hygiene; a Handbook of Health.	.80	12
Sabbath Readings; moral and mercenary anecdotes, &c.	.60	12
Spiritual Gifts. Volume I, as the Great Outpouring, &c.	.50	8
" " " II. Views and Incidents.	.60	8
" " " III. Only Men of Old.	.60	8
" " " IV. Death, Testimonies, &c.	.60	8
The Advent Keepsake. cloth, 200.	.40	4
Scripture Doctrines of Future Punishment, by H. H. Delaney.	.75	14

SEND FOR OUR CATALOGUE.